



SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Draft Long Term Plan

2018 - 2028

SUBMISSION BOOKLET FOUR
Submissions 100303 - 100402



[100303] - Ms Mary McIntyre

Address: 16 Potters Lane Lansdowne Valley RD2 7672

Postal Address: 7672

Phone (day): 033228717

Phone (mobile): 0272868482

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

My property at 16 Potters Lane, Lasdowne Valley, shares a boundary with part of Burkes Bush Rd. I request that the Selwyn District Council includes within its plan the marking with survey poles and sign posts the correct line of the existing unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to the Summit Road. This would provide a round trip walk and mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road. You might like to add something like: The walking /cycling section of the Plan overlooks the need for walking / cycling access from the Selwyn District to the Summit Road and the Port Hills. The Port Hills are a very important environmental asset to both the City and Selwyn Districts and I believe that walking and cycling access to these areas should be enabled.

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.

[100304] -Springston Hall Committee Ms Christine Bezar

Address: 11 Leeston Road Springston 7616

Postal Address: Secretary Springston Hall Committee, 25A Leeston Road, Springston

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)

The Springston Hall Committee asks that the targeted rate for the Springston Hall be raised above the proposed 2.5% to \$40 for the next 3 years if the proposal for district-wide rating for halls does not get implemented.

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	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	The submitter requests that the Springston Community Centre targeted rate be raised above the proposed 2.5% to \$40 for the next 3 years if the proposal for district-wide rating for halls does not get implemented. Based on planned expenditure, the required rate level for the Springston Community Centre area is \$24 in 2018/19 increasing to \$29 by 2027/28.

[100305] -Springston School Mrs Allana Taylor

Address: 16 - 20 Leeston Road Springston 7616

Postal Address: 16 - 20 Leeston Road Springston

Phone (day): 03295724

Phone (mobile): 021 202 6499

Email: allana.taylor@springston.school.nz

Submission

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

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Selwyn District Council appreciates and recognises the good work that Springston School has carried out, with the support of Te Ara Kakariki and Enviroschools, to plant around 2000 native plants in the area, and to develop the environmental awareness of the pupils at the school. The efforts that the students, teachers and school community have made towards the regeneration and enhancement of Chamberlains Ford has been of great importance to the improvement of the site. The Council notes the wish of the school students that the Council develop a long-term vision that values the environment and supports and enables the student led environmental education in a meaningful way. Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity related planning and works and will continue to support the good work that Te Ara Kakariki and Enviroschools do with pupils in the district.

[100306] - Mrs Prudence Thwaites

Address: 535 Hororata Road Hororata 7572

Postal Address: R D 2 Darfield

Phone (day): 3180807

Phone (mobile):

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)

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)

In favour of a walking 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.

[100307] - Mrs Rosalie Snoyink

Address: 6 Homebush Road Glentunnel 7638

Postal Address: C/- PDC Glentunnel

Phone (day): +6433182632

Phone (mobile):

Email: rsnoyink@xtra.co.nz

Submission

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

I do not support district wide rates for this purpose.

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

I do not support the proposal to extend to the 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)

I do not support the funding of indoor court and sports hub from district wide rates. I prefer Option 3.

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 chlorination of community water supplies in Selwyn. To chlorinate good potable water is an overreaction to the Havelock North contamination event, which was caused by poor management by the HDC, by not maintaining the supply. The Havelock North fault was not caused by an insecure water source. There is no need to chlorinate the whole of NZ because of the Havelock event. NZ's waterways and oceans are already under threat by the volumes of chemicals, fertilisers and contaminants pouring in everyday. Don't add to the chemical load on the environment.

I understand water at the Hartley Road supply source is secure and that the infrastructure is in good condition. There is no need to PERMANENTLY chlorinate this supply. This is an option of last resort, NOT 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)

The water races are now a good habitat for biodiversity. To close them would add to further loss of biodiversity, all but 'wiped out' on the Canterbury Plains. Nothing much remains of native biodiversity, we have done a magnificent job of removing any vestige of native flora/fauna on the plains. Continue with the existing method of funding races and where large irrigation schemes (in particular CPW) require the races to be closed or moved, then this cost should fall on 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)

I do not support combining community funding into a single contestable fund. Environmental funds should be increased and kept separate.

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

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, I do not support ratepayer funding for the extension to the SDC offices in Rolleston.

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

I support funding for cycleways, however the proposed cycle way from Kirwee to Darfield would be an imprudent use of funds. It appears this part of the proposal has not been well thought through.

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

Other matters. I could not find anything in the 10 year Plan that mentions protecting the natural environment. Seems the Council's total focus is on built infrastructure and community services. I would like to remind the Council that under the RMA section 3 (1) (b) iii you are responsible for maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Objectives in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement are to halt the decline of Canterbury's native biodiversity.

Indigenous biodiversity in NZ is in crisis. The ongoing loss in Selwyn District is of serious concern.

I request the Council, over the next 10 years, grant considerable more funding to the Biodiversity Fund to be used in halting the decline of native biodiversity. Only .5% remains on the Canterbury Plains. What `s left is significant and needs protection. It is urgent to survey, identify and manage what `s left.

The number of staff working in biodiversity should be increased as well as extra funding for monitoring and enforcement.

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 does not support

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 at Foster park and associated district wide funding model 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: 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 proposes Environmental funds should be kept separate and increased . It is likely that Environmental Funding will be now kept separate at this time. No increase to proposed funding anticipated

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 supports the cycleway programme with the exception of the \$1million 2022/23 Kirwee to Darfield link

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Council recognises that native habitat loss has been considerable over the Selwyn District and has employed a full-time biodiversity coordinator whose top priority is the management and protection of existing biodiversity. As part of the District Plan Review process the (native) vegetation clearance rules are being reviewed by a working group of stakeholders. The proposed District Plan is

scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue.

Council staff agree that there should be increased funding and resources put into biodiversity protection and management, associated monitoring and enforcement of rules.

[100308] -Tai Tapu Community Association Mr Gerald Carter

Address: 766 Christchurch Akaroa Road Tai Tapu 7672

Postal Address: 766 Christchurch Akaroa Road

Phone (day): 021 373538

Phone (mobile):

Email: gerald@cartersmith.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)

The TTCA is proposing a walkway / cycleway following SH75 and the Halswell River between Golf Links Road and Old Tai Tapu Road as you enter Tai Tapu village.

Walking / cycling is a popular recreational activity in Tai Tapu and this section of road not the safest due to visibility and shading.

The community is developing walkways around the Rhodes park and this section will be the last to complete.

While it may take some time to complete this section, we are asking the council to provide sufficient initial funding to undertake a survey of this section of road / river reserve so the the route can be planned and costed

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

This walkway alongside SH75 is not identified in Councils 2018 Draft Walking and Cycling Plan. The Association was asked on number of occasions to provide comment on the Tai Tapu forward programme but no reply was received . This particular link has a serious issue to overcome to relating to the lack of safe pedestrian facilities across the SH75 Suckling/Haswell River Bridge should this be considered as the connection to Old Tai Tapu Rd rather than across the existing small bridge via the Church (this is why this small bridge was provided to circumvent the SH75 road bridge). As along SH75 NZTA approval would be required to install pathways and modify the bridge and this work would be costly. It is considered this pathway is not necessary as there linking pathways through the Rhodes Reserve from the golf course out to Old Tai Tapu where a new bridge and footpaths have been recently constructed to link to the township.

[100309] - Yvonne Thomas

Address: 373 Hawkins Road Hororata Hororata

Postal Address: Hororata

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: themanorhouse0@gmail.com

Submission

7. We are opposed to the Building of a Community Centre in Hororata.

With an income of \$2000 per year from rentals it is obvious that a new hall is not needed. The expenditure of \$4.100,000 for such a building will be an enormous cost on the small community of 125 approx. The current hall has history and is adequate for the little use it gets.

What Hororata needs before a new hall is a fit for purpose stormwater system in the village to stop so many houses being repeatedly flooded.

The Bealey Rd drain was budgeted in the 2009/10 and should take precedence along with the curb and chanel of Hobbs St which has been in the budget twice but not done along with the underground wiring, budgeted but never done. These should all be done before a new hall is built.

The feasibility study and plans have been done by Go Hororata who have had public excluded meetings for many months. There needs to be a survey of the public and full disclosure of costs to rated propertys along with the feasibility report which has Private and Confidential on it. It should be a public document and all the details freely available to everyone rated.

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 support a facility in Hororata and is of the view that the first priority for expenditure should be on fixing storm water issues. 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. Information on the proposal is freely available in the community and is on the Hororata Trust website and has been included in newsletters sent to residents. There have also been a number of meetings for the public to attend and provide their views in developing the proposal.

Topic: Flooding issues - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Council has provided budget over the next ten years to address flooding issues across the district. Funding will be prioritised based on project merit.

[100310] - Nancy Catherine & David Neal Borrie

Address: 14 Liffeyfields Drive, , Lincoln, 7608 Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: 14 Liffeyfields Drive Lincoln

Phone (day): +64211809220

Phone (mobile):

Email: borrien@kinect.co.nz

Submission

Selwyn District Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Consultation Document Submission: NC Borrie & N Borrie Introduction: Selwyn is projected to grow significantly in the next 10 years. In light of this increase in population and the consequent demand on existing services and for new services Council needs to review the Policies relating to the level of provision, development, maintenance and funding of its services and facilities so as to ensure residents have affordable access to the level of Council services required by their community. The public needs easier access to Council's Policy Manual so they can see the criteria that Council is using when making decisions regarding their communities. Policies also need to be regularly reviewed so that they are relevant to the changing circumstances. 1. District wide rate for community centres and halls and for reserves: Mobility enables people to travel throughout the District to access the services and facilities of their choice. This causes an increased burden on the community in which those desired facilities are located, for example wear and tear; over-crowding.

In some instances it may be more equitable if rates are levied District wide. However Council has to look very carefully at the long term needs of each community to ensure that it does not inadvertently create an inequitable level of service within the District, but rather promotes the wellbeing of all groups within the District.

2. Selwyn Aquatic Centre extensions. Council needs to reconsider this major expenditure in light of its impact on the level of services that other communities in Selwyn will have to forgo in order for extension to proceed. It also needs to consider the impact Council's provision of these facilities will have on commercial businesses who offer the same or similar services. Centralization of services in one location may have benefits, such as economies of scale, in the initial stages of a facility's life cycle. However Council needs to consider the long implications of such a policy, for example when the Aquatic Centre is expected to meet the needs of 80,000 people.

Duplication of similar facilities, either through the upgrading of existing facilities or building of additional facilities is potentially more desirable in the long term and would increase the availability of services to all socio-economic groups within the District.

For example there are a number of swimming pools in the District (e.g. Darfield, Southbridge, Sheffield) that could benefit from being covered or heated so that residents had an extended or year round swimming season. Other communities designated for significant growth do not have a swimming pool (e.g. Lincoln). Upgrading or building a swimming pool in conjunction with other service providers would generate economic development/employment within local communities.

Communities such as Prebbleton and Leeston, would benefit from the inclusion, for example, of gym facilities into their new community facilities. The needs and long term benefits to all communities should to be considered by Council.

Council needs to take into account the level of services that Christchurch City and Canterbury Regional Council are providing or planning to provide. Council's policy of centralizing services and facilities at a District level is basically providing a regional facility that is utilized by people from across the Greater Christchurch area. It is to be hoped that Council is actively working with representatives from these organizations to ensure that any proposed development is integrated into a regional network of facilities.

I ask that, prior to proceeding with the proposed extension to the Aquatic Centre, Council undertake a study of the feasibility and long term benefits of enhancing the existing Council funded swimming pools in the District and make this available for communities to consider. It would also be helpful for growing communities like Prebbleton and Lincoln to know if, when and how Council intends to provide swimming/aquatic facilities within their communities.

3. Sports hub in Foster Park. While it is recognized that Rolleston is expected to grow and requires sports fields, the assumption that these are also for District wide use will see them heavily used and, like the Aquatic Centre, requiring expansion within a relatively short time frame.

All District communities are going to experience an increase in the use of and demand for their facilities. It would be wiser for Council to develop facilities in Rolleston to meet the need for the Rolleston community and to look at expanding recreation facilities in other communities so as to distribute the load across the District. This would be more equitable, improve accessibility and be more sustainable.

4. Chlorination of water supplies. While Council is required to supply safe drinking water to ratepayers on reticulated water supplies, not all supplies are unsafe or insecure and require chlorination. UV treatment of all supplies is advisable but chlorination should be limited to only those water sources known to be subject to contamination. Many of the township water supplies are from deeper more secure bores and are treated, as a precaution, with UV. Chlorination is not required. Chlorination imposes an additional cost on individuals who are allergic to it as they have to install filters on all the water outlets in their homes.

Council should also be looking at ways of protecting the land around potential water supply sites. For example via the District Plan when the District Plan review is undertaken. This should be given a high priority by Council given the importance of safe drinking water.

7. Development of Community facilities in Hororata, Prebbleton and Leeston. Further to my comments in 1, 2 and 3 rates money from the Rating area surrounding a community needs to be used, first and foremost, to improve the well-being of that community, before it is siphoned off to build centralized facilities in another community. A local community facility creates a community focus and meeting point and enhances community well-being.

Improving community facilities in communities, such as Hororata, Prebbleton and Leeston, need to be given priority over the development or expansion of District wide/regional community facilities. Economies of scale should be balanced against local community well-being and enhancement as well as affordability and ease of access for individuals and families. Improving local community facilities that are easily accessible by bike or on foot would also be in line with the Council's walking and cycling strategy and improve residents' health and well-being.

8. Expansion of Selwyn District Council Offices. This needs to be done in a way that enables the Council Office building to be repurposed in the event of there being a local Government reorganization. It could be anticipated that, within the next 10 years, parts of Selwyn District could become part of a Greater Christchurch Urban Authority.

9. Draft Walking and cycling strategy It is encouraging that Council is promoting walking and cycling within the District. Council needs to consider how existing footpaths within urban areas, could be adapted to create a shared cycle/walking corridor. Such corridors are common in other parts of the world, do exist within some townships and should be expanded.

10. Other comments Council needs to ensure that it not only promotes sustainability but also leads by example. Technologies, such as harnessing solar or wind energy for heating Council buildings and running Council vehicles; rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling, should be adopted by Council wherever possible. This would reduce the long term running costs of Council services.

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 Council undertake a further feasibility study including provision of aquatic facilities in Prebbleton and Lincoln. Submission also proposes gym / wellbeing facilities in Leeston and Prebbleton Community Centre builds. Officers note original business case was undertaken from which this proposal comes. In addition Council Officers are currently investigating private aquatic facilities in Lincoln with an interested party.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff support a network approach to facility development with local facilities being provided supported by a regional facility that can cater for a multitude of different activities at different scales. Many sports are requiring multi- indoor court facilities for both competition and training and it would be impossible to duplicate the scale of facilities required in multiple locations.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter supports proposals to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and

Prebbleton over regional scale facilities and wishes to see local funds used for local facilities first and foremost. Council needs to be mindful of providing a range of facilities that cater for both local and district needs which may be of differing scales and usage. This enables more efficient and sustainable delivery of services and needs to balance both the urban and rural aspirations.

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 supportive. The street upgrade plans for Gerald St include creating shared spaces plus the District Plan review will be bolstering this aspect as well. However the ability to retro fit can be limited by existing road reserve widths and other existing infrastructure.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100311] - Mrs Grace Taylor

Address: 23 Albert James Place, Dunsandel 7682

Postal Address: 23 Albert James Place, Dunsandel, R D 2, Leeston

Phone (day): 03 3254554

Phone (mobile): 027 322 1151

Email: gtx2nz@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 this is a conundrum for the SDC. It appears a lot of effort is going in to contain a hefty rates rise in Rolleston.

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre? (see pages 14–15) We should be more ambitious on this one. I would like aquatic facilities future proofed and a 50m pool built. In a country surrounded by water, and divided by lakes and rivers, access for children to become competent swimmers and learn water safely is paramount. With now polluted and diminished water ways, the opportunities for free learning opportunities are few. With past central governments, failing to support schools in the upkeep of school pools, the council really needs to take the lead. If this means delaying a fitness programme space, so be it. An Aquatic centre is about POOLS. Build a 50 metre pool. Lets put Selwyn on the map for 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 agree with the need for an indoor sport hub but question why this facility is proposed for Rolleston. It seems all major facilities are going to Rolleston. Why not somewhere else? If it proceeds, it should be rated using a similar formula to the aquatic centre. ie by zones.

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies based on a risk assessment? (see pages 18–19) I think more emphasis should be put on dealing with the source of contamination, ECan should be encouraged to increase compliance monitoring, and SDC improve maintenance of horizontal infrastructure. Chlorination of water supplies is a license to pollute. NO CHLORINATION thanks.

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) A modern community facility in Leeston is long overdue. Placement needs to be within walking distance of the township.

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) Extending current offices is preferable to leasing. Staff productivity is better when accommodation is good.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme? (see pages 28–29) I support proposals that make cycling and walking a safe and healthy option for the community. The council should also be looking at linking to recreational opportunities in the port Hills. Sign posting of access ways for walkers and mountain bikers would help eg the unformed Burkes Bush Road from its beginning off Early Valley Road all the way to

the Summit Road, would provide a round trip mountain bike route via Kennedys Bush Track, Summit Road, Burkes Bush Track, Old Tai Tapu Road. This would be a good one to start with.

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? With the recent draft Govt Policy Statement on Land Transport indicating funding will be available for rapid transit in Christchurch I would hope the SDC are looking at securing land suitable for supporting infrastructure. eg park and ride sites.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for an extension to SAC is noted. 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 Support for an Indoor sports facility is acknowledged. With regard to a Rolleston location the Foster park masterplan always proposed an indoor centre to be built here. In addition if a major regional facilities are to be built and accessed by as many residents as possible a central location near the major population bases of Selwyn makes good sense. A Rolleston location is reasonably central to the major population towns in Selwyn (Rolleston, Lincoln, Prebbleton and West Melton) as well as minimising the distance required to be travelled by both Malvern and Ellesmere residents. Access to Rolleston via state highway is also a key factor affecting location of a regionally significant facility that will be accessed regularly by users from outside Selwyn (Christchurch, Waimakiriri and Asburton). It is noted that a district funding model similar to that applied to the aquatics centre is preferred.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

persistent. This residual can offer protection for water in distribution system pipework after it leaves the treatment plant.”

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's view that there is a need for community facilities in Leeston to service this community is consistent with the staff assessment of the situation. The requirement to be in walking distance from the town is noted.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments 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: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Council is has for sometime identified options for Park N Ride Sites in both Rolleston and Lincoln on Council land. These will be introduced and staged to cater for demand and to coordinate with the direction identified in the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Futures Business Case. Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast includes a Rolleston Park N Ride \$1.5 million in 2030/31 as a "place holder".

[100312] - Mrs Julie Sadler

Address: 2/118 Alpineview, West Melton Christchurch 7675

Postal Address: 2/118 Alpineview R D 5 Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 3474258

Phone (mobile): 027 2016046

Email: j.r.sadler@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) I think it is probably a good idea provided all Halls are treated equally. The exception to this is Kirwee where the Hall is privately/community owned. If money is collected from the Kirwee Community Hall rating area the money should be given to the Kirwee Community Hall Assn.

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 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) Chlorination treatment should occur for the community water supplies are at risk of contamination.

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 should be a standardised rating system for all water race schemes.

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

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

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) No comment

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? (a) I have a concern about the timeframe for the widening of Hoskyns Road from Jones Road to State Highway 73. This road has had hugely increased traffic over the last few years. With Iport and Izone industrial parks on this road the traffic increase has resulted in a lot of trucks traveling this road all hours of the day and night. As we live on Alpineview it can be extremely dangerous trying to get onto Hoskyns Road when trucks are coming both ways. The seal is hardly wide enough for trucks to pass each other. The road narrows from West Melton Road heading towards SH73. This part of the road has broken shoulders due to trucks driving on the edge of the seal. The plan proposes that widening will be projected for 2022 - this is 4 years away. With the development of Iport ramping up and further expansion of Izone truck movements along Hoskyns Road will more than likely double over the next 4 years. The residents along Hoskyns

Road should not have to put up with the state of this road for another 4 years before Council makes the improvements to make driving on this road safe for everyone.

(b) Another concern of ours is the intersection of West Melton Road, Weedons Ross Road & State Highway 73. I am aware that this is a Land Transport matter and they are not proposing to look at it for another few years. The current intersection of West Melton Road and Weedons Ross Road is very dangerous. When I travel home from work I travel west on SH73 and turn left into Weedons Ross Road and then right onto West Melton Road. Night and morning this intersection is extremely busy. If there are several people turning off SH73 onto Weedons Ross Road there is huge potential for an accident to happen if I have 3 cars behind me and I can't turn off onto West Melton Road. Although there are yellow marking for no stopping cars do not allow enough space for cars to turn into West Melton Road. I think Council should be making submissions to LTSA to have this intersection upgraded before there are any more accidents there.

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

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for chlorination of high risk sites. Below are comments from Council staff.

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

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

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

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

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

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Hoskyns Rd Seal widening project is programmed for 2022/23 and is second in priority in the seal widening programme. The first priority is the upgrade of Weedons Ross Rd related to coordinating with CSM2. The 2018 Draft Regional Land Transport Plan identifies the NZTA SH73/Weedons Ross Intersection project as a high priority. Council takes all opportunities to advocate to the NZTA it should be done in the next three years as they have previously indicated.

[100313] - Mr Lyell McMillan

Address: 105 Altonbrook Road, RD3 Leeston 7683

Postal Address: 105 ALtonbrook Road, RD3 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021730571

Email: mcmillanlg@yahoo.com

Submission

We submit that the land on the southern side of Marshs Road (being the boundary between Christchurch City and the Selwyn District) from Shands Road to Springs Road in the vicinity of the new Southern Motorway have a change of land use in order to allow industrial activity in that area. With the development of the Southern Motorway in this area along with the land being contiguous to Waste Management Christchurch and other industries, as well as having high tension power pylons running through the area, we believe the best zoning for this land would be business to allow for development in keeping with the activities on the Christchurch City side of the land. The current zoning of this area is rural inner plains and we would submit that the land use be reconsidered taking into account the reasons listed above.

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

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

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council staff note your suggestion that the land on the southern side of Marshs Road (being the boundary between Christchurch City and the Selwyn District) from Shands Road to Springs Road in the vicinity of the new Southern Motorway have a change of land use in order to allow industrial activity in that area, and for the reasons noted in your submission. Council is currently working through its District Plan Review. One of the topics for consideration is growth of townships, including Prebbleton, and the use of the surrounding rural land for either residential or rural residential growth, business and industrial land growth, or continued use as rural productive land. The District Plan Review will be a publicly notified process where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue.

Council is also working closely with the Greater Christchurch Partnership through the development of a Future Development Strategy as a response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity. This is to be notified around August this year and completed by December 2018 and will address the business capacity, including industrial, needs of the greater Christchurch portion of the Selwyn District.

This strategic planning work is required to be undertaken alongside any required infrastructure planning. To allow for funding for future infrastructure in this Long Term Plan beyond that currently prescribed in Council's 30 year Infrastructure Strategy would be out of alignment with appropriate planning processes. I note the land you are promoting is not currently proposed to be serviced in the Council's 30 year Infrastructure Strategy. I note also that the land you are promoting be rezoned for future development currently sits outside of the Infrastructure Boundary on Map A contained in Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. It also sits outside the Prebbleton Structure Plan area, and is not identified as an area for rural residential development in the Council's Rural Residential Strategy.

Reviews of both the Prebbleton Structure Plan and the Council's Rural Residential Strategy are not currently scheduled within the Council's Strategy & Policy Work Programme and are dependent on the outcomes of the Future Development Strategy as a response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity by December 2018. This response will also inform the District Plan Review and any other subsequent RMA and LGA processes.

It is appropriate that the matters you raise be considered through the District Plan Review, the Future Development Strategy and subsequent RMA and LGA processes, and not through the Long Term Plan process. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others, and as noted the Future Development Strategy is to be notified around August this year.

[100314] - Mrs Angela Chaffey

Address: 376 Rakaia Terrace Road Bankside 7783

Postal Address: RD 13 Bankside

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 0273329272

Email: machaffey@xtra.co.nz

Submission

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

Mike & I fully support the proposal to develop a new community facility at Hororata over a general rate.

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.

[100315] - Dr. Johannes Welsch

Address: 1/7 Burrows Place Christchurch 8041

Postal Address: 1/7 Burrows Place Ilam Christchurch 8041

Phone (day): 02102537156

Phone (mobile): 02102537156

Email: welsch_j@gmx.de

Submission

Kia ora,

I would like to commend you on the continued support of biodiversity work in the district and the particular support of Te Ara Kākāriki Greenway Canterbury Trust. Their work is essential and significant to restore biodiversity in the Selwyn District. I hope you will continue the support and further enhance your contribution to an important community engagement and biodiversity enhancement - delivering a legacy in the district.

The biodiversity gains delivered by Te Ara Kākāriki add a new level of education, and assist landowners in the district to plant areas of native plants. This will help deliver on the community expectation of habitat for birds, terrestrial invertebrates, water quality and quantity across the district. This will ultimately help restore our natural heritage.

The trust has a great reputation amongst working and supporting landowners, engaging a wide range of ages and cultural backgrounds across the district and getting plants in the ground with recently surpassing the 50,000 plant mark to help stop the biodiversity decline in the district.

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 long term plan of delivering stepping stones has just become a bit more real with a key property being for sale adjacent to the Coes Ford Reserve.

I would urge the council to consider the purchase of the 11.5ha block on the true left along the Waikirikiri river and the true right of Silverstream. The site provides ample opportunity for biodiversity habitat, community recreation, wetland and dry land experience, and would show SDC willing action on the ground for the greater good of the whole Selwyn community.

Engaging closely with TAK on such a key site would have multiple social, ecological, economical benefits for the community and the council

Therefore, I urge the council to continue the support for the work of the Trust and what is currently achieved through the collaboration and exploring the huge potential of adding to the Coes Ford council reserve and delivering biodiversity in action and on the ground. I 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.

Ka kite Johannes

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 programme of 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 necessity of the Trust to have financial security into the future. This will allow the Trust to continue to provide restoration advice, funding and volunteers towards indigenous habitat creation through its Greendot programme. This will help with the ongoing restoration of our natural heritage in the district.

Council staff note the potential to create a 'legacy site' at the bottom end of the Silverstream catchment and are happy to engage with TAK in this regard. This potential project could improve water quality in the Waikirikiri Selwyn river, build on the restoration work that has taken place at the Coes Ford reserve, develop wetland and dryland habitats, create an area for community recreation and create meaningful on the ground actions.

Council notes your point that it is likely that the District ratepayers will recognise and demand the need for greater support for biodiversity restoration in the future.

[100316] - Mr Jason Hardy

Address: 2 Landor Common Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: @ Landor Common

Phone (day): 3474454

Phone (mobile): 0276024388

Email: jas.jenSlingshot.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 opposed to any car parking on the Rolleston Reserve on Tennyson St which is still a reserve to be used for the library community center, commercial and business. Keep it green

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	The carparking is a condition of the reserve exchange process that was adopted by the council and cannot be changed.

[100317] - Mrs Cara Minson

Address: 766 brookside rd Christchurch 7677

Postal Address: 7Rd chch brookside rd

Phone (day): 0275448889

Phone (mobile): 033476071

Email: chopper2@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

Burkes Bush Rd is an unformed legal Road that runs from the beginning of Early Valley Rd (near its intersection with the Old Tai Tapu Rd) and goes all the way to the Summit Rd. Most people don't use it because it is not well marked bit it would make for a great round trip on foot or mountain bike with Kennedys please open this track.

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 . Please open this track.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

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

[100318] - Ms Sylvia McAslan

Address: 785 Pigeon Bay Road Akaroa 7583

Postal Address: 785 Pigeon Bay Road RD 3 Akaroa

Phone (day): 0272649277

Phone (mobile): 0272649277

Email: sylviamcaslan@gmail.com

Submission

Community facilities, recreation reserves, specifically Coes Ford

Kia ora I would like to commend you on the upgraded facilities and plantings at Coes Ford. This has long been a highly valued recreational area for people from around Canterbury. The increased plantings provide valuable community engagement/education, enhance the enjoyment of the area as well as reflecting the increasing appreciation of biodiversity values.

There is an opportunity to expand the existing Coes Ford reserve on the north bank of the Selwyn river, upstream of the Ford. A key property is for sale adjacent to the Coes Ford Reserve, with LINZ land surrounding it. The area includes the confluences of Snake Creek, McGraths Creek and Silverstream, it is largely low lying and is begging to be a wetland. I would urge the council to consider the purchase of the 11.5ha block on the true left of the Waikirikiri river and the true right of Silverstream.

It is rare, undeveloped river margin and if secured, the existing values would be maintained, and in the long term could be enhanced. There is wetland habitat, dryland habitat, the potential for flood attenuation, public access for recreation, and improved water quality outcomes (due to wetland or other 'treatments').

This site has a huge potential for community and environmental benefit.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on your long term plan.

Ngā mihi Sylvia McAslan

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Thanks very much for the positive feedback

[100319] - Mr Adele King

Address: 484 Sandy Knolls Road Christchurch 7675

Postal Address: 484 Sandy Knolls Road RD 5 Christchurch

Phone (day): 033474195

Phone (mobile): 0272851719

Email: peterandadele@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) Open the Early Time Valley Mountainbike Track for the enjoyment of many Selwyn resident
10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters?

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

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

[100320] - Mr michael Ransome

Address: 258 Hartleys Road Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: 258 Hartleys Road Whitecliffs Coalgate RD

Phone (day): 03-318-2831

Phone (mobile):

Email: mjransome@hotmail.com

Submission

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

I would suggest that this will end up being an unfair rate on the smaller communities, with larger communities with large centres paying less than the smaller communities with small halls.

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

If the users of the Selwyn Aquatic Centre want a bigger a bigger Centre then the users should pay and not expect the far flung areas to pay. Very few people seem to use the amenity from these outer areas. Another words user pays. Keep the local pools open.

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)

By all means if Rolleston wants tennis courts then build them but once again don't expect outlying areas to cough up the funds when they are of minimal use to people living far away. Option 3 with a targeted rate paid by Rolleston ratepayers and user pays for every else.

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)

More complete maintainance being a better choice. Keep the status quo and issue boil water notices when necassary. All chlorine does is save the council from keeping up with maintainance. Also chlonine has too many side effects. Keep it out of 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)

Again user pays. What good, water wise or environment wise, is it to everyone, if you live miles away from it? I have to pay for my stock water and I don't see anyone looking to help pay for mine.

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)

Keep it the same as it is. It works okay now so don't mess 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)

Build the extension if it's really needed but don't make it look just like a lager Correctuion Institution!

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

No, but keep the spending under control and don't let it become a another grand thing that nobody uses or only Christchurch people use.

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

Yes

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

The submitter suggests that this will end up being an unfair rate on the smaller communities, with larger communities with large centres paying less than the smaller communities with small halls.

The introduction of a district-wide rate will see ratepayers pay a uniform rate across the whole district.

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

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments submission proposes user pays

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Support for this facility based on local Rolleston funding is acknowledged. The needs analysis conducted around this facility demonstrates that high levels of use will be made of these facilities from areas outside Rolleston (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: 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 to "keep it the same" is acknowledged (I think this comment may have been aimed at the Community Grants Scheme?).

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 supportive with some reservations

[100321] - Mrs Doreen Holland

Address: 257 Weedons Road, RD 4 Christchurch 7674

Postal Address: 257 Weedons Road RD 4

Phone (day): 03 325 2225

Phone (mobile): 0274991723

Email: doreen.h@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?

I would like to see consideration given to a hospital out in Selwyn area. I know you are doing 10 years from now, but plans for available land should be being made NOW as 10 years will go by very quickly!! In 10 years the Christchurch Public Hospital will definitely NOT be big enough for the population - it hardly meets the cities needs now?

I commend the council on the Izone Park that was planned over 10 years ago?? Great forward thinking, please continue the great work.

The proposed park on Levi Road is wonderful for the future use of residents, but also I would love to see a plan for it & layout & planting of trees etc being done NOW.

Thank you for the opportunity to have a say.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - 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 Health Hub Project: The submitter supports the Health Hub concept and would like to see a range of services provided. The submitter's request is acknowledged and can be considered as part of developing more detail on the range and extent of services provided through the Health Hub.

District Park - Levi Road - design/engagement processes will commence in 2019/2020

[100322] - Mr Jason Hardy

Address: 2 landor common Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: 2 landor common Rolleston 7614

Phone (day): 033474454

Phone (mobile): 0276024388

Email: Jas.jen@slingshot.co.nz

Submission

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

I am opposed to any car parking on the rolleston reserve on tennyson street which is still reserve to be used for the library community center commercial and business keep it green

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: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

The new Library/Community space requires it own carparking that cannot be placed on the reserve.

The reserve exchange process decision, required separate carparking for the reserve use. this cannot be changed to any significant degree and certainly not constructing the carparking as requested is legally possible.

Pragmatically users of the reserve or library will use which ever carpark space is most convenient to them. there is no intention of enforcing who can use which carpark spaces.

[100323] - Mr John Clarkson

Address: 1701 Coaltrack Road Greendale 7671

Postal Address: 249 Greendale Road R.D. 1 Christchurch

Phone (day): 0276160823

Phone (mobile): 0276160823

Email: FarmerJohns@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 have concerns that they do not appear to treat everyone fairly. Communities that currently have targeted rates will pay more. Greendale, Glentunnel, Dunsandel and others are paying for upgrades and that is going to continue, we are then being asked to pay for others. Our improved facilities will last a number of years before they need work so the benefit is a long way in. If this proposal is past then a rates rebate is required to level the rates bill.

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

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)

Foster park is mostly for Rolleston. The villages of Selwyn have a lot of well maintained parks and reserves. So the need for the rest of Selwyn to help Rolleston build their park is not favored.

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 MALVERN HILLS WATER DOES NOT NEED 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)

There is merit in combining the rating districts. The water races currently serve more than just the farming district, they have been around for over 130 years and their usage has changed. They also support and maintain a large environment of birds, bees, fish, and insects etc. The races draw about 7 cumecs of water from the rivers of Selwyn 24/7 of which about 90/95% goes to ground. This has a beneficial effect on ground water levels and lowland streams. Hororata township lost their shallow aquifer once a local race system was closed. CPW has so far not committed to supply 365 days of stock water. They will have down time in the off season for maintenance so it might be a while between drinks.

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

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

If these districts need these facilities and they can raise some monies towards them then I am not in a position to stop them

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 more office space is required perhaps a lease would work, offices built by a developer. Parking is a disaster, that is for real.

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

Its ok, some seem expensive but appears not to have a big effect on rates

10. Other comments: Do you have any comments on other projects in this consultation document or on any other matters? Several 1 Council need to fast track flyover from Rolleston town to Hoskins/Jones road. Lights don't cut it. 2 There is no plans for land set aside for park and ride parking. Land around the old station is getting less through development. Rail travel will come. 3 Road maintenance in the Malvern District is appalling. Holes are filled only to reappear a week later. The roading budget needs some serious work. Roads like Bealey Leaches Greendale and many others have way more traffic, particularly trucks hauling gravel, milk, logs etc and the shoulders are falling off quicker than they are repaired. Humps and bumps get missed altogether. 4 Parks Reserves and Halls. The council must maintain local committees to maintain these facilities. Locals are better at this than council staff as they do not see the detail. Locals can monitor delinquent behavior and get it sorted and it also helps with the owning of the facility. Some parks require a higher standard of maintenance than others because of the type of sport played.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission indicates no support for SAC as a facility not used by residents other than Rolleston residents. Officers advise the facility is used by residents outside Rolleston

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments This submission suggests that Rolleston alone should pay for this facility. However as demonstrated already by the Aquatics Centre model and Foster Park generally these regional level facilities are accessed and used by a wide cross-section of the Selwyn community. The needs analysis conducted around the Indoor court facility clearly showed that the facility will be used regularly by residents outside the Rolleston township.

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.”

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 qualified support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton so long as the communities raise money towards them 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. Affordability reflects current subsidy assumption assistances by the NZTA

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - 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 2018 Draft Regional Land Transport Plan identifies the NZTA SH1 Rolleston Interconnection (aka "flyover") Project as a high priority. It is understood from the NZTA they wish to start the Detailed Business Case phase in 2018/19. Council/Crown/developer land is currently earmarked for a longer term Park N Ride bus/train for Rolleston. Council has continual challenges in maintaining a large rural low volume within funding envelopes currently available. Indicative increases to Councils maintenance and renewal activities by the NZTA will help assist in maintaining suitable level of service however it is clear the NZTAs focus is to fund higher volume roads of more significance to achieve better value for money returns.

[100324] -Selwyn Youth Council Mr Tyla Harrison-Hunt

Address: 2 Norman Kirk Drive Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 033472956

Phone (mobile): 0275495108

Email: tyla.harrison-hunt@selwyn.govt.nz

Submission

This submission is on behalf of the youth of Lincoln High School students based in Selwyn. A 'What do YOUTH think?' workshop was undertaken on Tuesday, May the 1st at 12.30pm at Lincoln High School. This is supported by the Selwyn Youth Council.

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

N/A

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

Feedback provided in the workshop included more spectator seating, better racing blocks, hydrosides, gripped tiles at the end of the pools, 50m lane pool, diving boards, more inflatables, sauna/steam room, kids 'learn to swim area, outdoor pool, eating space for people who don't want to buy food, food and drinks, tog dryer (like Hanmer), older kids pool (for teenagers), wave pool, more spas, more lanes, bigger carpark,, pool buoys for community use, open leisure lanes, and a cafe. Submitted from approximately 35 students- all different age brackets.

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 students also voiced their opinion below and would like to see- Rock climbing wall, speakers for events, indoor skate park, free wifi for non-sporty people, studio space to book for martial arts and dancing etc., squash courts, interchangeable nets, love the walking top track idea, plenty of equipment like mats, balls etc., good drinking fountains, warm up area, good seating for watching games, basketball hoops, elderly friendly area, martial arts room, high ceiling, international courts to fit volleyball, basketball and netball, portable bleachers, boxing studio readily available for everyone, look at unipol in Dunedin, go big so don't have to spend money to upgrade, MMA hexagon, music rooms and a gym.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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)

N/A

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

The students would like to see more mountain bike tracks, West Melton-Rolleston track, a safe track from Springs to Rolleston, more scenic walking routes, bike tracks with jumps, BMX track, adventure park idea, high ropes course, make a destination, zip line, family areas on route, Tai Tapu to Lincoln, slow and fast lanes, Springston to Rolleston bike track

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

Complete feedback on A2 sheets are available in the corporate offices with Tyla Harrison-Hunt (956)

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. Youth consultation (35 students) included increased spectator seating, better racing blocks, hydrosides, gripped tiles at the end of the pools, 50m lane pool, diving boards, more inflatables, sauna/steam room, kids 'learn to swim area, outdoor pool, eating space for people who don't want to buy food, food and drinks, tog dryer (like Hanmer), older kids pool (for teenagers), wave pool, more spas, more lanes, bigger carpark,, pool buoys for community use, open leisure lanes, and a cafe. Submitted from approximately 35 students- all different age brackets. Spectator seating, learn to swim area, area for people who do not use cafe to sit and eat, public swimming lanes, and a cafe are already included in existing plan

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

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

Staff Comments Support for the proposed Indoor Court facility at Foster Park is acknowledged. The concept of a multi-court multi purpose facility that is not over-specified is consistent with the philosophical positioning of this proposed facility. There will be a limit to how many activities can be incorporated into a single facility but the concept of a multi-use community facility is supported by staff.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments BMX, Mountain bike facilities come under the jurisdiction of the Property and Reserves Dept. The are not part of the Walking and Cycling Strategy that relates to transport primarily. The Draft 2018 LTP includes Lincoln to Tai Tapu 2019/20, West Melton - Rolleston 2026/27, Springston to Rolleston 2027/28 as per identified by the submitter.

[100325] -Sheffield Waddington Reserve Board secretary Mrs Karen Battersby

Address: 84 Roecombe Road Sheffield 7500

Postal Address: 84 Roecombe Road, Sheffield

Phone (day): 03 3183726

Phone (mobile): 0274730973

Email: murrellen@xtra.co.nz

Submission

The Sheffield Waddington Reserve Board committee request funds of \$11,500 (allocated for the renewal of play equipment in the 2021/22 financial year) and \$6,000 (allocated for renewal of softfall in the 2025/26 financial year) be brought forward to the current financial year 2018/19, to assist with the relocation and upgrade of the play area and equipment, to comply with health and safety regulations.

The existing play area is sited on top of water and power services to the domain and pavilion.

The playground has been temporarily closed due to contamination of the pea gravel caused by the repair of a leaking water pipe, which is under the play area.

In its current location, concern has been expressed that any upgrading undertaken could cause major damage to the services i.e. water and power as they are only 400mm under playground.

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	Sheffield Reserve Playground: Staff have been working with the committee on the issues around the current play equipment and fully support bringing funding forward as noted in the submission to address the safety concerns. The impact of this is minimal given that the budgets are already included in the LTP and are not significant amounts.

[100326] -Selwyn District Council Mr Andrew Boyd

Address: 2 Norman Kirk Drive Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: PO Box 90 Rolleston Christchurch

Phone (day): 0275344013

Phone (mobile): 0275344013

Email: andrew.boyd@selwyn.govt.nz

Submission

.

Topic: Waste Management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	Comment from Solid Waste Manager (who wrote this submission): To summarise the submission provided, I am requesting that the Councillors approve: - a change to the LTP budget to allow for a new expenditure line for the processing of Kerbside recyclables as a result of the impact of the Chinese legislation on worldwide recycling markets. - an increase to the annual recycle bin charge of \$9. (The effect of this new cost is \$17 per bin per year. The Solid waste budget can absorb much of this, but not all. Therefore a change to the recycle bin pricing from \$63pa to \$72pa is sought).

[100327] - Mrs Kathryn Mentink

Address: 435 Southbridge Dunsandel Road Killinchy 7682

Postal Address: As above

Phone (day): 7412206

Phone (mobile): 0211093470

Email: theellesmereecho@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?

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	No comments made.

[100328] -Lincoln Community Committee - Secretary Pauline Hayes

Address: 45 School Road Tai Tapu 7645

Postal Address: c/- P O Box 80 Tai Tapu

Phone (day): 03 3296045

Phone (mobile): 021724915

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

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission does not support SAC development

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The 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. 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: 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 Lincoln Community Committee’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 LTP includes 9 specific roading upgrade projects worth \$12 million relating to the adopted Town Centre Plan. A specific reference was on page 33 of Councils 2018 LTP consultation document! A further \$2.6 million is included for the next 10 year period. Gerald St upgrade works are planned to start in 2023 which will have to include full reconstruction of the carriageway to achieve the new layouts. Holding maintenance will have to continue in the meantime. The district plan requires property entrances to face the street to meet urban form outcomes unless there a significant extenuating circumstances. Alternative linkages for the Rail Trail through Flemington are being progressively achieved. Council is working on a plan to rationalise and mark carparks on the side streets to Gerald St. Council has been actively seeking and purchasing land for additional public car parking in Lincoln e.g. William St carpark (refer Douglas Marshall). Long term Park N Ride facilities to cater for demand will be required to coordinate with the direction identified in the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Futures Business Case.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - 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 is in support

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Thank you for your submission. Council staff support the funding of the Lincoln Town Centre Plan within the 10 year plan and understand the urgency to implement the Lincoln Town Centre Plan in its entirety. Work is already underway to purchase land for car parking to enable the development of the town centre. It is recognised that the volume of traffic through Lincoln has increased significantly due to the substantial growth of the surrounding residential areas. The work has been programmed and indicatively costed to enable it to be underway, however the funding is yet to be confirmed through the Long Term Plan to ensure this takes place.

In terms of Birchs Road, Council staff acknowledge the concern with respect to driveway accesses being provided to Birchs Road. Staff through consenting processes for subdivision seek to reduce the opportunities for this to occur where possible through the design of the subdivision. This is not always possible but where it is it is certainly encouraged to avoid the conflicts noted in your submission.

In terms of parking in Lincoln Township, Council staff support your comments in regards to parking on West Belt, the realignment of parking in Maurice Street and the establishment of a Park and Ride facility in Lincoln to accommodate the growing demand for public transport to, from and within the township.

[100329] - Mr Nick Williams

Address: 72 Jacks Drive West Melton 7918

Postal Address: West Melton

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 027 220 5995

Email: nick.williams@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

1. Rural Road speed limits. This is progressing and I applaud that. Unfortunately there are still many of our relatively tight narrow roads with T and cross road intersections which are really dangerous. The max speed on all these roads should be 80kph. I can't believe how many people do 100kph in some areas where it is plainly unsafe.

(received via the Mayor)

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The Governments recent Road Safety Summit identified safe rural speeds was an important issue. The Canterbury Regional Road Safety working Group wishes to proceed with a Regional Speed Limit Strategy. When further information becomes available Council will consider on how it may align with any regional or national directions. Council has just introduced a 80 km/hr in most of the Greater Christchurch area of the District.

[100330] -Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board Dr. Mick Abbott

Address: Christchurch Christchurch 8140

Postal Address: Private Bag 4715 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: mgrandiek@doc.govt.nz

Submission

Murray England Asset Manager Selwyn District Council

04 May 2018

Dear Murray

Please accept the letter of 14th November 2017 from the Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board as a submission to the SDC long term plan with regard to the future of the water race network

In addition we would like to add the following • Congratulate the Selwyn District Council on acknowledging the contribution the water race network makes to replacing natural ecosystems lost through development over many years • Point out that the network not only makes a vital contribution to aquatic biodiversity, as your background report highlights, but also to diversity and abundance of non-aquatic species of birds, insects and plants. • Suggest that until the whole water race system is funded by a general rate there will be continued, perhaps accelerated, closures of races and loss of habitat and biodiversity and we urge SDC to bring forward the contribution from a general rate.

Yours sincerely

Robert Wynn-Williams Deputy Chairman Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board -

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: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your support.

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.

[100331] -c/- Aston Consultants Ltd Kevin & Bonnie Williams

Address: Christchurch Christchurch 8140

Postal Address: PO Box 1435 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: info@astonconsultants.co.nz

Submission

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

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

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council staff note your suggestion that the land on the north-western side of Shands Road (in the vicinity of the new Southern Motorway) have a change of land use and appropriate servicing provided in order to allow for future rural residential or urban development in that area, and for the reasons noted in your submission.

Council is currently working through its District Plan Review. One of the topics for consideration is growth of townships, including Prebbleton, and the use of the surrounding rural land for either residential or rural residential growth, business and industrial land growth, or continued use as rural productive land. The District Plan Review will be a publicly notified process where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue.

Council is also working closely with the Greater Christchurch Partnership through the development of a Future Development Strategy as a response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity. This is to be notified around August this year and completed by December 2018.

This strategic planning work is required to be undertaken alongside any required infrastructure planning. To allow for funding for future infrastructure in this Long Term Plan beyond that currently prescribed in Council's 30 year Infrastructure Strategy would be out of alignment with appropriate planning processes. I note the land you are promoting is not currently proposed to be serviced in the Council's 30 year Infrastructure Strategy.

I note also that the land you are promoting be rezoned for future development currently sits outside of the Infrastructure Boundary on Map A contained in Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. It also sits outside the Prebbleton Structure Plan area, and is not identified as an area for rural residential development in the Council's Rural Residential Strategy.

Reviews of both the Prebbleton Structure Plan and the Council's Rural Residential Strategy are not currently scheduled within the Council's Strategy & Policy Work Programme and are dependent on the outcomes of the Future Development Strategy as a response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity by December 2018. This response will also inform the District Plan Review and any other subsequent RMA and LGA processes.

It is appropriate that the matters you raise be considered through the District Plan Review, the Future Development Strategy and subsequent RMA and LGA processes, and not through the Long Term Plan process. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others, and as noted the Future Development Strategy is to be notified around August this year.

[100332] -Lincoln Developments c/- Aston Consultants Ltd Lincoln Developments

Address: Christchurch Christchurch 8140

Postal Address: PO Box 1435 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: info@astonconsultants.co.nz

Submission

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

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

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council staff note your suggestion that the land on the north-eastern side of Lincoln township Outline Development Plan Area 3 have a change of land use and appropriate servicing provided in order to allow for future urban residential (LZ zoning or equivalent) northwards to Tancreds Rd, as shown on the amended Lincoln Outline Development Plans (ODPs) map attached to your submission, and for the reasons noted in your submission.

Council is currently working through its District Plan Review. One of the topics for consideration is growth of townships, including Lincoln, and the use of the surrounding rural land for either residential or rural residential growth, business and industrial land growth, or continued use as rural productive land. The District Plan Review will be a publicly notified process where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue.

Council is also working closely with the Greater Christchurch Partnership through the development of a Future Development Strategy as a response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity. This is to be notified around August this year and completed by December 2018.

This strategic planning work is required to be undertaken alongside any required infrastructure planning. To allow for funding for future infrastructure in this Long Term Plan beyond that currently prescribed in Council's 30 year Infrastructure Strategy would be out of alignment with appropriate planning processes. I note the land you are promoting is not currently proposed to be serviced in the Council's 30 year Infrastructure Strategy. I note also that the land you are promoting be rezoned for future development currently sits outside of the Infrastructure Boundary on Map A contained in Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. It also sits outside the Lincoln Structure Plan area, and is not identified as an area for rural residential development in the Council's Rural Residential Strategy.

Reviews of both the Lincoln Structure Plan and the Council's Rural Residential Strategy are not currently scheduled within the Council's Strategy & Policy Work Programme and are dependent on the outcomes of the Future Development Strategy as a response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity by December 2018. This response will also inform the District Plan Review and any other subsequent RMA and LGA processes.

It is appropriate that the matters you raise be considered through the District Plan Review, the Future Development Strategy and subsequent RMA and LGA processes, and not through the Long Term Plan process. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others, and as noted the Future Development Strategy is to be notified around August this year.

[100333] -GFR Rhodes Estate c/- Aston Consultants Ltd GFR Rhodes

Address: Christchurch Christchurch 8140

Postal Address: PO Box 1435 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: info@astonconsultants.co.nz

Submission

-

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

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

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council staff note your suggestion that appropriate provision for servicing be made to allow for change in land use for the GRR Rhodes Estate/Prebbleton land (the Site) and other land as appropriate west of the current urban boundary as far as Shands Road, for urban residential purposes (Living Z zoning or equivalent) for the reasons noted in your submission.

Council is currently working through its District Plan Review. One of the topics for consideration is growth of townships, including Prebbleton, and the use of the surrounding rural land for either residential or rural residential growth, business and industrial land growth, or continued use as rural productive land. The District Plan Review will be a publicly notified process where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue.

Council is also working closely with the Greater Christchurch Partnership through the development of a Future Development Strategy as a response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity. This is to be notified around August this year and completed by December 2018.

This strategic planning work is required to be undertaken alongside any required infrastructure planning. To allow for funding for future infrastructure in this Long Term Plan beyond that currently prescribed in Council's 30 year Infrastructure Strategy would be out of alignment with appropriate planning processes. I note the land you are promoting is not currently proposed to be serviced in the Council's 30 year Infrastructure Strategy.

I note also that the land you are promoting be rezoned for future development currently sits outside of the Infrastructure Boundary on Map A contained in Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. It also sits outside the Prebbleton Structure Plan area, and is not identified as an area for rural residential development in the Council's Rural Residential Strategy.

Reviews of both the Prebbleton Structure Plan and the Council's Rural Residential Strategy are not currently scheduled within the Council's Strategy & Policy Work Programme and are dependent on the outcomes of the Future Development Strategy as a response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity by December 2018. This response will also inform the District Plan Review and any other subsequent RMA and LGA processes.

It is appropriate that the matters you raise be considered through the District Plan Review, the Future Development Strategy and subsequent RMA and LGA processes, and not through the Long Term Plan process. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others, and as noted the Future Development Strategy is to be notified around August this year.

[100334] -Rod Donald Banks Peninsula Trust Mr Richard Suggate

Address: Little River Little River 7591

Postal Address: PO Box 5 Little River, Banks Peninsula

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: richard.suggate@gmail.com

Submission

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	This submitter refers to the overall need to make provision for more recreational walking tracks etc. using unformed roads in the Port Hills area and calls for the Walking and Cycling Strategy to make for specific provision for this. As per other submissions Burkes Bush Rd, Gerkins Rd and an extension of the Rail Trail linking to Tai Tapu (that had previously been identified by staff sometime ago). As stated in response to other submissions the current Walking and Cycling Strategy and the new Draft allows the use of unformed roads on a "as is where is basis". The Strategy's and accompanying Action Plan relate to providing walking and cycling facilities to provides alternative modes of active transport within and between urban settlements and funding comes from transport and township rates and subsidies to do this. It is staffs recommendation that should Council wish to get into the area of planning and providing recreational walking and mountain bike tracks using unformed roads then a separate strategy or plan be prepared by those staff able to do this beyond what transport activity can provide or cover.

[100335] -Spokes Canterbury Cyclists Association Mr Don Babe

Address: 4 Tisbury Lane Cashmere 8022

Postal Address: Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: tisberries@gmail.com

Submission

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

A very detailed submission advocating for cycling which is it considered is covered by the elements Draft 2018 Walking and Cycling Strategy. However as acknowledged by the Submitter he provides more from a experienced cycling/cyclist point perspective whereas the Strategy is clear in wanting to also encourage all people to walk and cycle more. Council staff have consulted with the City Council on the join up to their main networks but we also have to time and stage links for our strategic outcomes e.g. CSM2. This is documented in the Strategy. The suggestion to create a cycleway directly between West Melton and Templeton along SH73 is not supported as West Melton to Rolleston then CSM2 cycle links to Templeton will provide this as in the Action Plan. In response to the submitters summary points 1) the cycleways have been carefully prioritised as to timing 2) the strategy is careful to balance and cater for all types of users 3) acknowledged re tourism but this is not the driver for the Strategy 4) Council adheres to all relevant District Plan, national and other walking and cycling design standards as documented in the Strategy over all road types 5) National and regional initiatives are underway looking at overall rural speed limit management.

[100336] - Mr Ian Duff

Address: 54 Early Valley Rd Lansdowne 7672

Postal Address: RD 2 Christchurch

Phone (day): 03 3228449

Phone (mobile):

Email: glenys.ian@snap.net.nz

Submission

Submission

SHORT SUBMISSION ON BETTER PREPARING FOR LARGE SCALE DISASTERS.

OVERVIEW: This short submission is written in haste but the concepts involved have been given a lot of thought for a considerable time, especially since the disastrous fire of 13 February 2017, which started under pole AX728, on the roadside about 100 metres east of our property boundary. The fire, more than any other major disaster to date, has strongly reinforced the observation of Winston Churchill when he summarised earlier thoughts in similar vein:- Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

So it was with the fire. We had the parallel rather toothless Recovery Plans prepared by Selwyn and the City. The Goodwin Report detailed the good, the bad, and the indifferent of the various fire services. At the end of January this year the Still report to FENZ was released and this comprised a very convoluted thesis as to possible but extremely improbable fire origin. The key point is that none of these reports has come up with a single fresh idea to reduce the risk of this fire happening again, and this is what Churchill was on about.

The good news is that two of the three proposals that I am making in skeletal form now would cost almost nothing, but the last one would involve some capital expenditure by the Council. The bad news is that I would like to be heard at any hearing set up to progress the LTCP, in order to expand on skeletal concepts. I would like to see the inexpensive concepts being given very early consideration because they make sense not only for fires, but also in relation to the imminent big rattle along the Alpine Fault.

CREATION OF A PORT HILLS HIGH WILDFIRE RISK ZONE In Early Valley Rd alone our local fire group has dealt with many fires over the years but four of these fires stand out as having had the potential to escalate into wildfires of magnitude similar to last years event. Two of those fires were caused by children playing with fireworks, and the other two were caused by expulsion dropout fuses (EDO fuses).

In California and in at least three states of Australia they have designated high wildfire risk areas to reflect that danger. Higher engineering standards for hazardous utilities are required in these areas. Examples would be the requirement for non-inflammable ground cover to about a 3 metre radius under power poles on which EDO fuses are located, and fuse systems that are three and four generations more advanced than all the fuses currently fitted in our area. I appreciate that some improvement occurred in the re-organisation of fire services under the FENZ umbrella in the middle of last year but major defects remain. One issue that is even worse than before the FENZ transition is that Selwyn now has just two fire zones, Selwyn Hill & High Country, and Selwyn Flats.

The Port Hills portion of Selwyn is now just part of Selwyn Flats! The name Selwyn Flats is appropriate on the largely irrigated land on the plains but it is absurd to include the volcanic slopes of the Port Hills in this zone. Did the fire services learn nothing about adabatic winds, water shortages, difficult and dangerous access, steep gradients, and a shortage of helicopters in the February 2017 fire?

My proposal then is to work with the City and with DOC, and with Port Hills MP Hon Ruth Dyson to create a Port Hills Wildfire High Risk Zone on all of the Port Hills. Special requirements in this zone would be best international engineering practice for hazardous utilities (electricity, gas & oil pipelines etc), and the total banning of fireworks other than perhaps the mid-winter months of say June & July. On the fireworks issue is it really appropriate to continue to mark the anniversary of a failed political coup in England in the year 1605? If fireworks are so essential to the Kiwi psyche would a change of date from inflammable November to perhaps Matariki or thereabouts really be so onerous?

THE NEED FOR MORE HELICOPTERS IN AN EMERGENCY The critical shortage of suitable commercial helicopters fitted with monsoon buckets or high payload tank modules in the early stages of the 13 February 2017 fire was extremely unfortunate but largely unavoidable, because so many of those machines were already engaged in sluicing earthquake slip debris from SH1 on the Kaikoura Coast when our fire broke out. The need for lots of suitable helicopters is not confined just to fires. We need to be very mindful of the fact that the Alpine Fault last did a big move 301 years ago in 1717 and its movement cycle tends to be about every 300 years. When the next move happens, damage will obviously be extreme close to the fault line, but it is anyone's guess as to whether that will trigger a propagating swarm of connected faults also moving, just as they did in the "Kaikoura" event of November 2016.

We used to have a Wigram aerodrome used by the RNZAF but it has been turned into a series of residential subdivisions in recent years. The RNZAF used to base a helicopter unit at Wigram and it was equipped with Iriquois helicopters that had a fairly high payload capacity and a high altitude capability. They were also fitted with night vision equipment and their pilots had night vision operational ratings. At the time they tended to be a very useful tool in coastal and alpine rescue work, but the Iriquois machines have since been superseded by more recent machines. I am reliably informed that the RNZAF now have no helicopters based in the South Island.

My proposal here is simply one of suggesting that the Council actively lobby for the re-instatement of a high capability helicopter unit based here in Selwyn. A very logical choice of location would be Burnham military camp because their normal role in a military theatre is being an active partner to army units. In other words, they would do a lot of their training in support of the army, but would be available when the Alpine Fault moves again, or when another fire or flood or storm occurs. I am not suggesting that RNZAF units attempt to replace what commercial helicopters already do well in emergencies. It is just that we will need lots of heavy lift helicopters when the next big event occurs, and RNZAF machines fitted with night vision equipment and flown by suitably rated pilots would complement commercial operators. Summarising, what I am proposing is a win-win situation, good for the RNZAF and Army, good for Selwyn, and effectively neutral for the taxpayer.

A FIRE WATER MAIN IN EARLY VALLEY ROAD PLEASE I don't propose to revisit what went wrong in fire fighting efforts on the evening of 13 February 2017 but it is reasonable to note that urban units were clearly impotent when they couldn't plug into a fire water main fitted with standard urban hydrants. This may or may not have improved since the FENZ merger, but I do have to record that not one litre of our one hundred and eighteen thousand litres of stored water existing when the fire started was used by any official urban or rural unit in the first 24 hours of the fire, despite the availability of this stored resource being advised clearly.

In simple terms we need extra stored water of say 300 thousand litres coupled to a fire water main fitted with hydrants fitted at the usual standard interval of 200 metres along our road.

There I must finish with a deadline looming.

Ian H. Duff 04 May 2018

Topic: Zone issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	Thank you for your submission. I note your suggestion to create a Port Hills High Wildfire Risk Zone on all of the Port Hills. Council is currently working through its District Plan Review. One of the topics for consideration is Wildfire risk. The District Plan Review will be a publicly notified process where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue. It is appropriate that the matters you raise be considered through the District Plan Review and not through the Long Term Plan process. The proposed District Plan is scheduled to be notified in early 2020 for public submissions where the community will have an opportunity to make a submission on this issue and others. So far a Preferred Options report has been prepared and taken to Council for feedback prior to consultation with the public on this matter. A guidance sheet is currently being prepared and will clearly explain the endorsed options, with the inclusion of wild fire risk as a matter of control for the District Plan. The Preferred Options report presented to Council has been predicated on the principal of enabling people to create their own defensible spaces, and to restrict neighbouring landowners being able to compromise this space. It is relevant to note that based on discussions with FENZ that the main area of concern to them is the Inner Plains area, this is due to the high number of ignition sources, high fuel loadings from poorly maintained properties, and high levels of consequence (people and property). This is reflected in the concentration of fires that occur in this area. Going forward in the District Plan Review process, the endorsed options will be consulted on with the general public in July as part of the wider rural scopes of work.

[100337] - Sarah Walters

Address: 143 Midhurst Road Aylesbury 7671

Postal Address: R D 1 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: midhurst.sarah@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

Submission to SDC Long Term Plan May 2018

Water race rating review While I support the proposal to combine the three water race schemes and simplifying the various rating factors, I do not support the charges presented in the proposed rating structure.

Our property, located in a rural area, is 0.6ha. We have a small water race that runs along council land in front of property but does not enter it. We do not use the water – in fact there is often very little, or even no water, to access and it was completely dried out for a portion of last summer.

I recognise the environmental values in having water races (with some water in them!) continue in some areas and I am prepared to contribute financially, though increasingly begrudgingly beyond \$100p.a. The rate we pay in 2017/18 is \$156.67 p.a, previously \$130.55 in 2016/17 and \$121 in 2015/16. To be asked to pay \$300 in 2018/19 for this is excessive!

Our property was subdivided in the 1990's as a surplus farm property. We do not operate a business on it. In fact, our circumstances are much like the properties that used to exist along East Maddisons Road in Rolleston and pay initially \$10 and then \$20 beautification rate while we paid \$100 more – except that there is far more water in the race there. The proposed increase to the water race rates, without taking any other rating increases into account, would increase our total rates by nearly 10%. Ideally there needs to be either a better distinction between what a user and a non-user is (so that our property would be recognised as a non-user) or a much lower minimum charge (maximum \$100) for properties in our circumstance as the current system is very unfair.

Walking and cycling strategy

I encourage the council in it's endeavours to support walking and cycling. I haven't had an opportunity to review the document thoroughly, but would acknowledge and support this point from page 6: Transport has to be considered as a mix of modes and any journey will generally comprise a mixture (unless you are going from your garage to a drive through in your car). Thinking of connection points is important – where and how people combine their journey modes and the ease of circumstances of those changes. The document recognises that people will combine multiple trips into one trip, such as dropping children off at school on the way to work, but this doesn't have to be right outside the school gate if the connection between there and an alternative drop off point is safe. This mix of modes provides the benefits sought in the introduction on page one of the document as well as recognising the need to make trips multi-purpose. All it takes is one area of safety concern and the mode of an entire journey is altered.

Expanding on this point, having sealed off road cycleways does provide a safer journey in connecting townships, but unless the connecting points and safety within townships is fully considered, they will not be used to the extent they may otherwise. This includes making busy urban and rural roads wide enough to allow for cyclists where no cycleway exists and providing safe crossing points in townships.

Investing money which allows true transport choices will not result in people not using single occupant private transport, but can mean less reliance on them, even to the extent of households owning and running less or no cars – not just a huge saving economically, socially, culturally and environmentally for them but for all of us.

Support for Public Transport

Although I still support the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee as a means of governance for public transport, I don't believe it has delivered to the extent I expected. I have copied an extract of my submission to Ecan's LTP below which I believe is relevant to Selwyn.

"A good transport network should be fully multi-modal (trip chain) – just as it makes sense to have some freight on trucks and some on trains, it also makes sense for people to be able switch between cars, active and bus (or whatever form PT takes) transport for their travel requirements. Looking at PT as an isolated mode results in what Tom Godefrooij* describes as "System weakness public transport [which] brings you from a place where you are not to a place where you don't need to be (at a time that doesn't suit you)". There have been improvements in the network, but not to the extent there could be."

At the submission hearing (in relation to the very strong focus on commerciality) I asked Environment Canterbury to "change your lens and lift your game. We need accessibility and reliability, multi-modal connectivity, recognising the benefits of reducing our individual and collective environmental footprints and a public transport system we want to use and can all be proud of – faced with the alternatives, it's really not too much to ask for." I make the same request to Selwyn District Council as there are still several areas for improvement within your jurisdiction and areas in which you can have some influence.

Finally, please consider this quote from former Mayor of Bogota Enrique Penalosa "A developed country is not a place where the poor have cars, it's where the rich use public transportation"

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter is in support and references the benefits of sealed off road cycleways and planning and providing for multimodal journeys from beginning to end. This aspect is encapsulated in the Greater Christchurch partnerships Travel Demand Strategy and related programmes that Councils Walking and Cycling Strategy and Action Plan aligns and contributes to.

Topic: Public transport incl Light Rail - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Greater Christchurch Public Transport Committee is focused on completing its Public Transport Futures 30 year Business Case, in addition to the developing the new 2018 Regional Passenger Transport Plan - both have to reflect significant transformational changes and challenges for PT over Greater Christchurch. Selwyn is fully involved in supporting the Committee and Environment Canterbury who provide the PT services on achieving the agreed outcomes.

[100338] - Mr Graeme Roberts

Address: Not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: graemeroberts09@yahoo.co.nz

Submission

Submission

Submission for Long-Term Plan 2018-2028:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce a district-wide rate for community centres and hall, and for reserves?

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

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

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

2. Do you have any comments on the proposal to proceed with extensions to the Selwyn Aquatic Centre?

I can see this as a valuable asset for the area, was just a shame that with all the sub divisions going on when the pool was originally built, that the council did not have the foresight to build a bigger Centre, and we would not be going through this process now.

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 do you prefer?

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

4. Do you have any comments on the proposal to introduce chlorination treatment for some community water supplies, based on a risk assessment?

Between 4 September 2010 and today, the Kirwee water supply has had one significant e Coli event, which, it turned out, was due to earthquake damage to the reservoir and that damage was mitigated by a large-scale maintenance programme. Currently, our water is UV treated and as far as I'm aware, no other unnecessary chemicals are added to our water. We don't need fluoridation and we don't need chlorination, and long may it stay that way. The Central Government may run scared over the Havelock North water contamination issues, invoking Public Health scaremongering, but Council has an obligation for avoid poisoning our ratepayers unnecessarily.

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

No comment, other than to state that another increase does nothing to improve the temper of the voters. The fact that non-users pay for something that they don't use is certainly an issue worth discussing.

6. Do you have any comments on the proposal to combine the current community grant funding schemes into a single contestable scheme?

I certainly see this as a step forward!

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

I have no problem with the development of new community facilities in these townships, providing that the local communities fully support the developments and fund them. Facilities in a community, for a community, must be funded by that community. You just cannot keep on increasing other areas rates to build these facilities.

8. Do you have any comments on the proposal to build an extension to the Selwyn District Council offices in Rolleston?

If the extension is absolutely necessary, I have no objection, but Council will be under scrutiny over this project.

9. Do you have any comments on the draft Walking and Cycling Strategy and the proposed programme?

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

Long overdue need to see some serious commitment to this!

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

I would like to see the widening of Courtney Road, Kirwee, south of SH73 down past the new South Island Field Day area. I believe a submission was made to Council in 2017, but still nothing advised.

You are raising rates in the Kirwee area by 6.9%, would be good to see something done for the Kirwee area, rather than just draining this money out to other area projects.

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. 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 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 a local Rolleston rate to fund the proposed Indoor Court facility is acknowledged. The needs analysis conducted around the facility and analysis of the patterns of use for current facilities like the Aquatics Centre and Foster Park playground, sports fields and hockey turf clearly demonstrate that the facility will be used extensively by residents from outside the Rolleston township area.

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.”

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	No recommended action made.

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 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 objective for the draft 2018 Walk Cycle Strategy is to provide improved facilities within and between townships - not to promote national tourism e.g. Mountains to Sea but Councils is considering a feasibility study subject to funding for such a concept.

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

[100339] -Federated Farmers Philippa Rawlinson

Address: Not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021 151 2971

Email: prawinson@fedfarm.org.nz

Submission

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

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

Staff Comments The submitter does not support the introduction of a district-wide rate for community centres, halls and reserves in its current form. The submitter does support the introduction of a tiered district-wide rating structure for community centres, halls and reserves. It is the submitters view that a tiered approach delivers the most equitable outcome for all community members, as those that are most likely to derive the benefit from the service will benefit most.

A change to a tiered district-wide rate would be a more complex rating structure and would see ratepayers in the district pay a differential rate depending upon where their property is located.

The Council has considered a tiered structure as one option. It concluded that the network of Council facilities is available to all ratepayers and that a uniform targeted rate is the most suitable option.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission proposes Targeted rate should fund the SAC on basis that Rolleston users only, use SAC .Officers note that users of the facility come from places outside of Rolleston. In a four week survey in late 2017 . Learn to Swim participants Selwyn Central - 49%, Springs Ward 19%, Ellesmere 10%, Malvern 8% and the remainder are participants from outside Selwyn. SAC casual admissions Selwyn Central - 27.5%, Springs Ward - 19%, Ellesmere - 14.5%, Malvern 10.5% and the remainder are participants from outside Selwyn.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments This submission does not oppose the development of the proposed indoor court Centre at Foster Park. It is acknowledged that the submission supports a Rolleston rate to fund the facility and opposes the use of a district rate to fund its development. The needs analysis around this proposed facility as well as a observed patterns of use at the current Aquatics facility, the foster Park playground, hockey turf and sports fields all indicate a high level of utilisation from residents outside the Rolleston township. User charges will apply to assist with operational costs but the inclusion of capital costs associated with this project into user charges would push the cost of use beyond the ability of user groups to pay (similar to aquatics centres, sports fields, libraries, community centres).

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support 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: 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 Submitter does not express support or not but does encourage that Council ensures the community grants are contestable and transparent and that grant and funding recipients are accountable for the spend. Council is advised that this is the intention with the process being prepared for the Community Grants Fund

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 views of the Submitter to fund Councils Draft 2018 Walk Cycle Strategy and Action Plan from the Regional and/or Provincial Funding Sources an/or a specific targeted rate is not supported. Regional/Provincial Funds can only be used where local funding is not normally available for projects of regional benefit. Also they can not be used if other national funding is provided i.e. in this case NZTA funding in support of our projects. Like the roading network, the Councils walking and cycling network is managed and funded on a district wide "one network" basis.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter notes that "for 2018/19 the average forecast rates increase per rate payer will be 5.7 per cent, followed by an increase of 6.6 per cent for 2019/20 before easing off to 3 to 4 per cent per annum to 2027/28. These are significant rate increases projected by Council. Though we do note the significant growth pressure Council is under, it is also worth noting that the population increases will also have increased the Council's rating base. We do ask that the Council work to reduce rate increases to something closer to the rate of inflation." - The Council has sought to balance community expectations and rates affordability. Rate levels in Selwyn are comparable with similar local authorities. Rates increases are to provide improved levels of service and are not purely driven by cost increases.

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

Council has continual challenges in maintaining a large rural low volume within funding envelopes currently available. Indicative increases to Councils maintenance and renewal activities by the NZTA will help assist in maintaining suitable level of service however it is clear the NZTAs focus to fund roads of more use and significance to achieve better value for money returns. The submitters point that only urban arterials are being funded is not correct. 20 year transport funding forecasts include \$15 million for seal widening projects over the district and \$5.5 for Seal extensions all on the rural network.

[100340] - Mr Hamish Wright

Address: Not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: hamish.wright@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

To whom it may concern,

My name is Hamish Wright and I am the coordinator for the South Malvern Junior Cricket Club.

Our junior cricket teams make use of the Glentunnel Domain playing fields for both practises and Saturday games during the Spring and Summer months.

We began with just one team for the 2016-17 season, but have increased our number to four junior teams, with children coming from Glentunnel, Hororata and Windwhistle Schools to play. We expect this number to increase further for the 2018-19 season.

I am against the proposed District-wide rating for community centres and halls, reserves for the following reasons;

- Due to our increasing numbers of participation we potentially host 3 Saturday morning games on a weekly basis and next season we anticipate more. We also hold practises twice during weekdays. I have been very disappointed to see that the SDC managed system of mowing of the Domain appears to be poorly structured, with only intermittent maintenance conducted by the contractor (Sicon). It appears that they only mow the Glentunnel Domain at the same time as the local reserves and berms (as per the terms of their contract). The surface the children practise and play on has often not been fit for purpose and therefore I have had to solicit the help of volunteers to uphold an acceptable standard of care so that the games and practises can still go ahead. As a parent and rate-payer I find this situation very disappointing.

- We require a more structured level of maintenance by SDC, as the cricket season's weather can be changeable and therefore an adaptable approach is required. My concern is that a spread district-wide funding approach would not allow for this because only set funds might be allocated seasonally (as they appear to be now) which will prove to be inadequate.

- I am aware that we are not the only cricket club in this position and my concern is that as population pressures increase in the main town centres, District-wide funding could lead to services being further diminished for smaller communities such as ours, with less funding allocated where the population pressures are perceived to be less. Our primary goal as volunteer parents is to have our children outdoors, playing games and developing important life skills through sports and play.

As a rate-payer I want the rates that I pay to live in Malvern to be allocated, as required, towards local services and infrastructure to a standard that is appropriate and I do not believe that District-wide rating for community centres and halls, reserves will deliver this.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely

Hamish Wright

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

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

[100341] -Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (IPort) Mr Tim Carter

Address: Not provided not provided 8140

Postal Address: PO Box 2726 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile): 021 836 156

Email: tim@cartergroup.co.nz

Submission

Topic: Public transport incl Light Rail - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Staff consider the submitters concept (as a concept) is excellent and accords with Council's previous idea to provide the ultimate Park N Ride solution for Rolleston in this area. However this is dependant on whether this alignment for the flyover is chosen subject to further business case stages to confirm options by the NZTA. The concept does accord well with a providing multi modal coordination and options and may improve the attractiveness of this alignment option under the GPS. Councils 20 year transportation funding forecast includes a Rolleston Park N Ride \$1.5 million in 2030/31 as a "place holder". In response to the Submitters summary points 1) It is understood the NZTA wishing to progress the Detailed Business Case for the Rolleston Interconnection (aka flyover) in 2018/19 2) The Greater Christchurch Public Transport Futures Business case will guide what service and infrastructure are needed 3) subject to more confirmation on these aspects Councils engages with the Submitter further 4) the same as for 3) relating to KiwiRail.

[100342] - Mr Tony Armstrong

Address: Not provided not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: tonenange@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

Hello & to whom it may concern.

My query relates to :-

District Wide Tree Maintenance; Townships, Reserves & Streetscapes (page 36).

Assuming that this figure (\$2.4m) is total for ten years i.e. \$ 240,000 pa.

Question is , is this allocated on area basis or held in pool and open to bidding ? Is it intended for programmed or reactive works, operational or capital and is it discretionary or intended for contract allocation please ?

Thank you.

Regards,

Tony Armstrong

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	This budget is provided for tree maintenance/replacement on the various parks/reserves and streets across the District. The submitter will be written to asking for his thoughts but in general this budget will not be used for new plant out areas

[100343] -Fish and Game Emily Moore

Address: Not Provided Woodend 7641

Postal Address: PO Box 50 Woodend

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: emoore@fishandgame.org.nz

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.

Topic: Enforcement Comments and Issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Regulatory Section of Environmental Services is working through the process to further resource the compliance area. Proactive monitoring of permitted activities is part of the strategy being developed which will include education and where possible information gathering to substantiate what natural flora exists. This will give staff more confidence in pursuing compliance issues in the future.

Topic: Funding requests - Corporate

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	Council needs to consider the request for further funding to assist with the maintenance of biodiversity work. The following requests have been made: 1. That the Selwyn District Council contribute \$5,000 in 2018/2019 and 2019/2020. This could be done through the Selwyn Natural Environment Fund. and 2. That the Selwyn District Council take on the clearance of seven sediment traps in the Silverstream catchment from 2020 using general ratepayer funding. This is estimated to cost \$3,500.

[100344] -Courtenay A & P Association Sharon Kellock

Address: Not provided Kirwee 7543

Postal Address: PO Box 36 Kirwee

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

Friday, 04 May 2018 To the Selwyn District Council

A submission in response to Question 1 in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 The Courtenay A&P Association (Kirwee) are against the proposed District-wide Hall Rate in its current form.

The Kirwee Community Hall is privately owned by The Courtenay A&P Association, and the proposed District Wide Rate would be disadvantageous to the Kirwee Residents, where there is no Council-owned Hall facility. Fundraising and events pay for the use of the Kirwee Hall, which is available to all.

We submit that there should be provision for contributions towards the cost of running and maintaining private halls for the Communities' use. Regards,

Sharon Kellock

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

[100345] -Selwyn Sports Trust Mr Michael Wilson

Address: 1 Brynley Street, Hornby Christchurch 7656

Postal Address: PO Box 66 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: info@selwynsportstrust.org.nz

Submission

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for SAC development is noted. Submission proposes a 50 metre pool . Officers advise that Hon Megan Woods in Press Release 27 April, confirms the CCC Metro Sports facility is back on track and includes a 50 metre pool complex. Sport Canterbury reconfirms its support for a 25 metre pool as being sufficient for future needs in Selwyn.

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 at Foster Park is acknowledged.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The Selwyn Sports Trust's support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged. One of the underlying principles for the development of these facilities is that they provide multi-purpose venues for a range of community,cultural and recreation activities.

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

Staff Comments Selwyn Sports Trust request for Multi-Use Turf: The provision of a multi-use turf has been considered in planning for Foster Park as a future enhancement. At this stage it has not been included in the first 10 years of the LTP but is signaled in the Infrastructure Strategy. This project would require significant investment (\$1.0m+) but they have proven to be cost effective over the life of the asset. Staff believe that the need for this type of facility should be monitored and could

possibly be included in the next LTP subject to strong business case being prepared.

[100346] -Heritage New Zealand, Pouhere Taonga Milly Woods

Address: Christchurch Christchurch 8140

Postal Address: PO Box 4403, Christchurch Mail Centre

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: mwoods@heritage.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. In addition the submitter supports the continuation of a separate Selwyn Heritage Fund. This is the intent with the proposed Grants Review activity underay

[100347] -Chair, Environment Canterbury Regional Council Steve Lowndes

Address: 200 Tuam Street Christchurch 8140

Postal Address: PO Box 345 Christchurch

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: Governance@ecan.govt.nz

Submission

Topic: Biodiversity / Environmental issues - Environmental Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments A top priority for the Selwyn District Council is the protection of terrestrial indigenous biodiversity and the restoration of ecosystems and habitat. The Council commends and supports the new strategic direction of Environment Canterbury to do likewise and look forward to the future support of the Regional Council in this area.

In recent years our planning department and biodiversity coordinator have developed strong and effective working relationships, and associated joined up work programmes, with the relevant agencies including the Selwyn - Waihora Zone staff.

Council has made efforts to recognise and manage the benefits that water races provide in the district with regard environmental benefits. As such Council has chosen to leave some water races open and charge a District wide rating for their ongoing management.

Topic: Public transport incl Light Rail - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Submitter has acknowledged both staff and the Mayors endeavours to trial metro bus services between Christchurch and Leeston, Christchurch and Darfield. As a condition it requires Council to underwrite any possible losses if they are not economically viable. This is appropriate as ECan are already facing significant deficits in the operating of the current metro system and are even needing to withdraw some services. Previous indications Council may need to provide \$30,000 (TBC) underwrite any losses. Note the previous Red Bus Darfield Service was withdrawn as the company could not make it viable based on low patronage. On request they undertook another trial and this had the same result earlier this year and was withdrawn.

Topic: Water & waterways management - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your support for the new water race rating structure.

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.

[100348] -Motukarara Hall & Waihora Domain Mr Andrew Dean

Address: 35 Park Road Motukarara 7672

Postal Address: Motukarara

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: nzandydean@gmail.com

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)

I submitted orally last year about the caveats to the district wide rating for halls and domains. I would like to reiterate my concerns that a district wide rating will decimate local fundraising support for halls and domains. This is probably fine for halls and reserves under council control, but is destined to kill community owned assets.

The logic is 1. ratings mean locals do not wish to volunteer/donate to the hall/domain they already pay for. 2. without community support the hall/domain will be turned over to the council. 3. small underutilized resources (such as the Motukarara hall) will be deemed unnecessary and the council will opt to shut the resource.

It would be a shame and pointless to kill off the last bastion of community driven resources. We as the Motukarara Hall committee and as the Waihora Domain understand the challenge the council faces, but a blanket rating across the district will once again benefit the newer, flashier communities and further to neglect the old rural communities that once epitomized the district.

Our primary desire as community volunteers would be to leave the system the way it is. If you MUST blanket-rate the district, then funding should be set aside and offered to halls and reserves NOT operated by the council. e.g. If you charge the people of Motukarara for a hall and domain, then you should fund the Motukarara hall, despite its independent standing. I realize the primary function of the Selwyn District Council is to funnel money and resources to the people of Rolleston, but if you do this with Halls and domains,

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

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

[100349] -Southbridge Advisory Committee Mr Lieuwe Doubleday

Address: 17 John Street Southbridge 7602

Postal Address: Southbridge

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: Lieuwe7@outlook.com

Submission

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter does not support district wide rating for Community Halls.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission provides conditional support for SAC development on the provision that the build and operation of a gym / wellbeing space and cafe are contracted out to private business. Submitter supports continuation of tiered targeted rate.

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 at Foster Park on the basis of a funding model similar to the current Aquatic centre is acknowledged. No indoor court facility is proposed specifically for Southbridge in the LTP and any future plans for Indoor courts in Ellesmere District would have to be (from a capital cost and operational cost point of view) a regional facility perhaps based in Leeston.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The Southbridge Advisory Committee's qualified support for the proposal to provide a new community facility in Leeston is acknowledged. They believe that it should be funded locally or by a tiered system if district wide rating is brought in to recognize the funding already put into their facility at Southbridge. Council will make a decision on the rating approach in deliberating on the LTP and submissions received. A tiered system was previously looked at by the Rating Review Sub-committee and was not supported as an option as it is too difficult to establish in a fair and equitable way.

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 \$812,000 Leeston to Southbridge Cycleway for 2031/32. The Broad St footpath extension is already included in the township footpath upgrade forward programme depicted the Action Plan.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - 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 If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:

Staff Comments High Street Reserve Development: Staff agree that the current budget is inadequate to undertake the development of this new reserve area which will be a high amenity park in the centre of the township. The Committee have requested that funds are brought forward from a budget in 2020/21 to enable the project to be fully funded. In addition they seek funding from the Crossgates Reserve exchange process as a contribution. Staff agree that the Crossgates proceeds should be used to fund this project (this was the original intention to meet the cost of the land purchase which has, in the interim, been funded from reserve development contributions). The committee have suggested a total budget of \$200,000 for this project. Staff believe this is high for an area that is realivly small but recognize this will be a show piece site for Southbridge. Therefore it is suggested that \$100,000 of of the budget currently provided in 2020/21 (total \$184,880) is brought forward to 2018/19 for this project and is part funded from proceeds of sale from the Crossgates Reserve exchange (when this occurs). Anything additional required for this project can be funded directly from the monies held by the committee.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

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

Staff Comments Staff agree that it will be an opportune time coordinate with the Bellfield subdivision works to fill in the missing infrastructure north along High St such as a footpath etc. Discretionary budgets are not sufficient to cover the full extent of this work so it is recommended a \$250,000 project is added to the 2018 LTP for 2018/19.

[100350] -Tourism Industry Aotearoa Nieneke van Dijken

Address: 79 Boulcott Street Wellington 6140

Postal Address: PO Box 1697 WELLINGTON

Phone (day): 04 494 1842

Phone (mobile):

Email: nienke.vandijken@tia.org.nz

Submission

Topic: Tourism Services - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	Submission reinforces role of Council in promoting benefits of tourism, encourages Council to apply to Tourism Infrastructure Fund, consider infrastructure needs of tourism as well as environmental needs, consider national policy statement on freshwater management, provide events, measure visitor satisfaction, promote activities and events at off peak times, work with local airports and ports. Submission will inform the Economic Development Plan currently being prepared within SDC

[100351] -Hororata Primary School Mr Martyn Gameson

Address: 2548 Bealey Road Hororata 7572

Postal Address: RD 2 Darfield

Phone (day): 03 3180 803

Phone (mobile):

Email: principal@hororata.school.nz

Submission

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	Council will need to decide if it wishes to fund this specific school frontage upgrade beyond the confines of its Policy R411. Should it decide to it may very likely set a precedent that other rural schools will follow suit where Council has also declined in the past e.g. Glentunnel, Broadlands etc. This comes back to the original point view point that the responsibility is on the Ministry of Education to providing safe and effective school frontages and/or parking facilities in support of its activities/School Boards and not the districts ratepayers.

[100352] - Mrs Pam Williams

Address: 103 Pacific Drive Rakaia Huts 7683

Postal Address: RD 3 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: theoldetrout@gmail.com

Submission

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

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

Staff Comments Submission proposes development needs to be funded by users. Council is advised that this would not be practical and no examples of this exist across NZ

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support of a targeted rate for users of the proposed Indoor Court facility at Foster Park is acknowledged. The introduction of such a rate would be very difficult given the fact that the facility will be used extensively by residents beyond the Rolleston township.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Submission position not clear but suggest submission is likely intending Council not spend money on this 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 believes this is potentially another rate take imposition. How these facilities will be funded will be determined by the debate around district versus targeted rates meaning the Rakaia Huts residents will either pay something (from the proportion of Council grant to the projects) or via a district rate.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The Submitter is not in support. Staff attempted to make contact with Rakaia Huts representatives to discuss footpaths but no contact was able to be established. It is considered that the small and confined nature of the settlement does not require investment in a footpath network and also the practical issues of indistinct boundaries/land occupation.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	No comments made.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Staff will review the various trees at Rakaia Huts to ensure they are appropriately trimmed. Staff have received in recent weeks complaints about vegetation on private property's and on roadside verges. The council requests property owners to tidy up their own vegetation and only funds from council finances if a safety issue is apparent. Accordingly there can be dis-satisfaction from complainants about untrimmed trees.

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	It is not correct to state that proceeds from the Rakaia Huts camping ground have been used for flood damage at Coes and Chamberlains. Rakaia Huts receives an annual allocation of budget for maintenance and renewals separate fro other reserve/camping areas

[100353] -Little Rakaia Huts Community Committee Mrs Pam Williamson

Address: 108 Pacific Drive Rakaia Huts 7683

Postal Address: RD 3 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: theoldetrout@gmail.com

Submission

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

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

Staff Comments Submission opposes development

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Lack of support for a District funding model being applied to the Indoor Court facility is acknowledged. The facility like the current ones at Foster Park (Aquatics centre, Playground, hockey turf and sports fields) will be used extensively by residents beyond Rolleston.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

Topic: 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 qualified support for the proposal to provide new community facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton is acknowledged. It is unclear exactly what the issue is in terms of access to the Rakaia Huts community room as they have access when needed.

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 makes the point on that routine road maintenance should not be at expense of cycling proposals.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100354] - Mr John Forrester

Address: 29 Grassmere Road Not provided not provided

Postal Address: not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: jf@mhr.kiwi.nz

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)

I am totally opposed to the way these rates are being applied. These rates unfairly penalize small, remote properties like ours which is a holiday home and infrequently occupied.

The DWC rate represents a 10% annual increase, and the DWR is a 13% That is an annual rates rise of 23% before general increases are factored in. This is excessive, unfair and totally unacceptable. Considering that we are unlikely to use these facilities, these rates are even more unfair.

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

Given the popularity of this facility, it should be funded on a user pays system.

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 should be funded by a Rolleston targeted rate. Remote rural communities should not have to fund 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)

Our property is not on a community water supply

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

Great work

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Council's proposal is to set a uniform rate on all properties accross the District. The alternative approach is to design a rating system with Zones or exemptions. This would substantially complicate the rates system. The Council's aim has been to develop a simple system.

Topic: 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 funded by Rolleston targeted rate.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support of a Rolleston rate for the Indoor Courts proposal is acknowledged. The facility will be used extensively by residents outside Rolleston as per the current Aquatics Centre, Foster park playground, hockey turf and sport fields.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Submitter is in support.

[100355] - Mrs Pamela Hooper

Address: Whitcliffs Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: pugcity66@gmail.com

Submission

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)

What gives a handful of idiots the right to chlorinate a communities water supply against their will. Who do they think they are? God? I breed pedigree pugs therefore I need to best water, not only for them to drink, but to grow their vegetables.

I personally drink quote a lot of water and cannot tolerate the taste and smell. I am amused at the fact those who dictate what others should have never have it themselves. I suggest you all stay in your office and leave our drinking water as it is.

NO CHLORINE

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.”

[100356] - Mr Martin Dock

Address: 15 Elizabeth Street Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: martydock5@gmail.com

Submission

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 want chlorine added to 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.”

[100357] - Mrs Lynette Harris

Address: 910 Ellesmere Junction Road Ellesmere 7677

Postal Address: Ellesmere

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: lynetteharris@xtra.co.nz

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)

If a hall is privately owned, why should the ratepayers in the area pay rates on their hall? Who's to say those people will actually use other facilities in the district? How can you expect the local people to carry on volunteering their services to their local privately owned facility when they are paying huge rates?

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)

When the water races are not required on farm, why should the farmer pay per hectares for a facility over the whole property?

When enquiry made about cutting off an a small inlet which is not used, told us went past the property and had to pay.

This is the end of a line and a neighbor requires it through his property, but not required on our farm. Not acceptable.

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)

Wouldn't it be better to have people hot desking in the meeting rooms when they are not being utilized?

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: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The hot desking solution is used at workspaces where possible. One of the problems with the current accommodation is that meeting rooms are also at times

fully used so the solution of using meeting rooms is a short term day a by day option for hot desking which can work but is not always practical.

[100358] - Mr Tony Quinn

Address: 157 High Street Southbridge 7602

Postal Address: Southbridge

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

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

Good idea

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

Completely disagree with this idea. Live in Southbridge which has very good water supply. This was the reason we moved to Southbridge. Chlorination is necessary in some instances, but NOT here.

If there ever was a problem, then UV treatment is the answer. Spent many years hunting in the mountains and took water from all kinds of sources, put it in a litre drink bottle and left in the sun for a day. Never had any problems.

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.”

[100359] - Val MacKenzie

Address: 49 Woodlands Road Sheffield S18 7SD

Postal Address: RD Sheffield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

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)

We as ratepayers, are totally opposed to chlorination of the water supply!! It seems like an easy option to slam some chlorine in the water rather than investigate when contamination occurs.

We believe there may be a backwash issue in Sheffield Township. Rather than this being investigated, the Council has deemed it appropriate to chlorinate the water long-term with no public consultation. That is not democracy as we see it.

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

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

As a ratepayer from Sheffield, I would like to see a bike track developed from Darfield to Sheffield, then onto Springfield. I believe this type of project would be well supported by the communities.

Our roads are so busy with trucks, tankers and general traffic. Where once I have happily biked down to Darfield, I would no longer contemplate that as an option. Let's get a bike path from Springfield to Rolleston and Lincoln and get active :-)

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 draft 2018 Walking and Cycling Plan includes connecting Rolleston to Springfield in successive stages through to 2036 at a total estimated cost of \$7.3 million. The first project Darfield to Kirwee is in 2022/23.

[100360] -Sheffield Waddington Township Committee Val Mackenzie

Address: 219 Woodlands Road Sheffield 7580

Postal Address: RD Sheffield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

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)

At a recent committee meeting, it was clear that NO ONE supported chlorination of the water on a long-term basis. We were all bemused as to how this has proceeded without community consultation.

Check where contamination may be coming from - back wash within the township - fix that issue, then we can continue to drink healthy, perfect water without chemicals

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

At our recent township meeting, we decided the township of Sheffield and Waddington require more street lighting to make walking and biking in the evenings a safer option.

The newest footpathing has made a big difference to both townships. We would like to see this footpath expanded in the future - down Railway Terrace East Sheffield, Hugh Street onto Charles Street to meet Waddington Road.

Please could you also consider a light at the intersection of Waimakariri Road and Curve Road. This intersection is extremely hard to identify in the dark, and a light would give a clear indication as to where the intersection is situated.

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 Current agreed levels of service for street lighting for smaller rural settlements are considered appropriate in these situations compared to a full urban standard. Council is replacing current lights with LED and this will improve all lighting situations. It will review after this if any further improvements should be funded. The footpaths identified are already in the townships forward upgrade programme in the Walk Cycle Action Plan. The installation of a flag light at the Waimak Gorge Rd/Curve Rd will be added to the low cost/low risk improvements forward programme.

[100361] - Mrs Pamela Reveley

Address: 24 Norris Street Prebbleton 7604

Postal Address: Prebbleton

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: pamprev@gmail.com

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)

It's a big district and I'm not sure Arthur's Pass benefits from a new community centre in Prebbleton. Theoretically, I agree, but can see dissent. Prebbleton people make far greater use of city facilities than halls etc, in Malvern Southbridge etc.

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

It's a good facility and needed. Hopefully extensions would not add to the noise level which can diminish the enjoyment of swimming there.

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

I think it is necessary to reduce travel out of Selwyn for sporting needs. Sport is a huge positive factor in adolescent health.

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)

Chlorinating Prebbleton's water supply is close to scandalous. We have the most beautiful water and we feel so privileged. This seems a knee jerk, industrial response to Hawkes Bay, despite us never having these problems and well maintained well/pumps locally.

Children happily drink water here - lets not jeopardize that.

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

I'm all for efficiency and happy to pay rates to support the community schemes described, especially 24/7. If a centralized fund made it harder for community groups to meet the criteria, and the paperwork to apply more difficult, I would not support change.

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

The Prebbleton Hall seems to meet community needs on any occasion I am part of. A future facility should only proceed as growth truly warrants it and it can be paid for.

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

Don't make them ostentatious - simple, efficient, practical, eco-friendly and with an earthy look is all that is needed.

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

More cycleways reduces traffic which is great, but not like the awkward ones in the city. Our existing cycle trails are very good.

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

The consultation document is well presented and easy to follow - thank you!

Please, please, please do something about our Springs / Shands Road traffic woes.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The support for the SAC extension is noted. Submitter also proposes design and build to better manage noise level. This is noted

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the proposed indoor courts facility is acknowledged. The need to support youth in the district through this facility is supported by staff.

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 submitter keen to ensure the process of applying is not complicated or difficult. Work is underway with the proposed scheme to make Community Grants Funding application process is relatively simple.

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 as the current facility is sufficient. 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	The Submitter is in support.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Current traffic patterns are very volatile in and around Prebbleton relating to the construction of Stage 2 of the Southern Motorway. Once completed it is expected this will improve as motorists use the Shands Rd Interchange. The 2018 LTP includes funding a \$24 million arterial intersection package on the perimeter routes around Prebbleton.

[100362] -Coalgate Glentunnel Reserve Management Committee **No name provided .**

Address: Homebush Road RD 1 7673

Postal Address: Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: poplargully@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

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

We support the reserve calculations as per the LTP, but we are concerned about the quality of mowing for different sporting activities.

We support the retention of the secretarial services as they stand.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

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

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 (identification not noted in system for responding by officer) requests continued funding for paid secretary services. Presumably for a Committee but no name noted in information

[100363] - Mr Ray Maginness

Address: 201 Herlerton Road Killinchy 7682

Postal Address: RD2, Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: ray.linda.mag@gmail.com

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)

Yes, as long as it's spread over the whole district, not just siphoned off for Rolleston.

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

I think Rolleston has a perfectly good Aquatic Centre, that many other towns don't. Similar pools in Leeston or Darfield would lessen the use of the Rolleston Pool. Spreading them about the district would lower the traffic flow to Rolleston and help get swimming clubs going again. Teaching more kids to swim would only save lives.

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 support a sports hut at Foster Park, but do support the development of indoor courts in other towns e.g. Darfield, Leeston, Southbridge, Dunsandel etc.

Communities need sports clubs. Why should Rolleston get everything . It makes other clubs always having to travel to Rolleston.

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 comment.

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)

This is one very old system and has served us well in the past, but its time is up. So please close the water race schemes down over a few years, as I believe they are one very expensive scheme to run from a farmers point of view. With race cleaning, drowned stock, and a rating system that charges over the whole farm when it serves only one or two paddocks.

I also believe the ground water is contaminated from the seepage from the races and is not fit for people to drink, so why are you allowing it to go to ground water?

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)

Very good idea, but a \$140,000.00 will be far too little to help fund the groups mentioned.

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 the lack of a community centre at Leeston needs addressing now and would be best sited at the Northern end of Leeston in the vicinity of the Ellesmere Heritage Park.

The cost would be much less now than in the future, and the cost of the refurbishment of the Leeston Rugby Club would be saved. Leeston deserves better.

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

Roading: seal extensions are pitiful at 8.6kms. There is only one thing farmers want, is a decent road to get themselves and their families to town as they live the furthest away from town halls, swimming pool and sports hubs as the Council seems to think people in outlying areas have to travel to Rolleston for everything. Maintenance on gravel roads is abysmal.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

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

Staff Comments Submission proposes aquatic facilities in Darfield and Leeston. Council will be aware that aquatic facilities already exist in these two locations as well as other locations across district.

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 Submitter suggests greater level of funding is required for Community Grants 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 view that there is a need for a modern community facility in Leeston to service this growing community is consistent with the staff's assessment of the situation as demonstrated in the needs analysis work undertaken. The preferred site for the proposed facility will be defined via an assessment process and with community input to ensure the best outcome and mixture of complementary facilities.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The programme has to strike the right balance on providing affordable and sustainable maintenance levels of service and high cost improvements like seal extensions.

[100364] - Mrs Annette Foster

Address: 57 Dynes Road Rolleston 7615

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: ap.dj.foster@xtra.co.nz

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)

Selwyn has 'come of age' due to its significance regionally. Time for district wide rating. Support district wide rating for community centres and halls.

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

Support increase in pool size. Consideration should be given to a 50m pool, plus 3m moveable wall, allowing flexibility for 50m or 2 x 25m pool use.

Fitness / wellbeing: Aquatic fitness appropriate only. Commercial fitness in Rolleston also need to be supported.

Café / Courtyard - support minimal development.

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: multi-use indoor Courts complex and sports hub at Foster Park.

The population has grown much faster than predicted - the need for the Indoor courts facilities and sports hub is NOW. Support the district-wide rate.

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)

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)

AA Facility - remove from headquarters building and relocate to retail area / private enterprise. This activity in Council Building might not take up much space, but it is not 'Council Core' activity.

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

Cemetery for Rolleston - Historically no churches were built in Rolleston (first church built in 1974). Most other towns in Selwyn have graveyards connected to churches or Council-managed cemeteries.

Long term and new residents need to feel a sense of belonging / connection to the area they have lived in. Consideration should be given to acquiring an area of land to create a 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 an extension to SAC is noted. Submitter also suggests consideration of 2 x 25 metre length pools, allowing for a 50 metre pool. 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. Support for basic cafe. Support for minimal aquatics rehab / gym nothing that will compete with commercial business. Business Plan for gym/ wellbeing centre currently being reviewed

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for both the proposed Indoor court facility and the district funding model is acknowledged. Noted and agreed that the facility is required in the short term and should not be not be delayed.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments 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.

[100365] - Mrs Susan Chaney

Address: 15 Armack Drive RD 7 7677

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: chaney@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Submission

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

It should have been 50m to start 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)

Chlorine can have adverse effects on people with skin or gut problems.

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

the IZone surplus should be used for an acoustic barrier to rectify the noise that exceeds the night-time limit at the Armack Drive Rural Residential subdivision.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Council notes your suggestion that the IZone surplus (which is from the general rate) should be used for an acoustic barrier to rectify any noise that exceeds the night-time limit at the Armack Drive Rural Residential subdivision.

At this point in time the Council does not consider it necessary to construct any such a barrier in this location as recent noise readings have demonstrated compliance with District Plan noise requirements.

It would not be the responsibility of Council in any case to construct such a barrier, if at all required, as this would be the responsibility of the activity creating the noise to mitigate it to an acceptable level in line with District Plan requirements or apply for resource consent.

[100366] - Ms Rachel See

Address: 31 Cuert Street Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: lets_braindance@yahoo.com.sg

Submission

Submission

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

No additional chlorine please. I am very happy and grateful for the water quality in Christchurch. This is the main reason why I settled in Christchurch, having lived in many places overseas.

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

More public transport options to link the Selwyn townships. Should increase the frequency of buses to these towns and to the city.

I do not drive and prefer to take public transport where possible. More environmentally friendly. I am happy with the metro bus services in the city and would advocate that we should have more services for the Selwyn area.

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: Public transport incl Light Rail - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The forthcoming new Regional Passenger Transport Plan will be reviewing all services and frequencies with the intent to improve services if affordable.

[100367] - Mr Barry Fletcher

Address: 21 Railway Terrace RD 1 7673

Postal Address: Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

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)

Please do not chlorinate the water any further as we have show dogs that are reluctant to drink the water - which makes them sick. 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.”

[100368] - Mrs Melissa Jebson

Address: 2091 Wards Road Charing Cross 7571

Postal Address: RD 1 Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: flocktonstud@xtra.co.nz

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)

As long as the smaller, rural community halls and outlying reserves are not forgotten, but get their share of revenue, I will support district-wide rating.

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, based on risk assessment. Yes - if the way the water is chlorinated does not affect BOTH taste and smell.

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

I support a walkway / cycleway from Kirwee through to Springfield.

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

Was disappointed that half of Wards Rd (from Essendon Road to Charing Cross) could not have been sealed after Downer and CPW left the road in a sealable state - all preparation had been completed.

It is still in a state that could be sealed. There are only two blocks of Wards Road from Rolleston to McLaughlins Road / Clintons Road in Darfield. A shame those two blocks could not be sealed.

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 draft 2018 Walking and Cycling Plan includes connecting Kirwee to Springfield in successive stages. The first project Darfield to Kirwee is in 2022/23.

Topic: Roothing - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Further work would be required by Council to bring this and other related parts of Ward Rd up to a suitable standard for sealing that is not budgeted.

[100369] -Glentunnel Township Committee Mr Reg Anderson

Address: 7D Homebush Road Coalgate 7673

Postal Address: RD Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: regandlyn1944@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

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

The Glentunnel Township Committee want the secretarial services of the Roving Committee secretary to continue and request extra discretionary funds to assist the Committee to pay for this service.

Our Committee had not been able to source a secretary voluntarily.

Since the Roving Committee Secretary has been involved in our Committee, we have functioned proactively and effectively for the betterment of our community.

Topic: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That this topic is outside the scope of the Annual Plan process and the following should occur:
Staff Comments	Glentunnel Township Committee request Council consider a modest increase to their Discretionary Fund to pay for the services of a Committee Secretary.

[100370] - Mrs Judith Topp

Address: 1 George Street Springfield 7681

Postal Address: Springfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

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

I would like to support the proposal for a BMX track in the old shingle pit beside the Fire Station.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments This request will be considered as part of the development of this shingle pit with is programmed for development in the 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 financial years with budget of \$22,000 over the 2 years.

Project design can commence in the 2018/2019 year but development cannot start until the current leases ends in June 2019. Notice of the lease not able to be renewed has been given.

[100371] - Ms Emmaline Sibbald

Address: 19 Hector Street Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: emmaline.sibbald@hotmail.com

Submission

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 am against the proposed chlorination of the water supplies. It is excessive and unnecessary to permanently chlorinate the water. The chlorination of water supplies in the Glentunnel and Whitecliffs area had adverse effects on the health of many residents.

The long term health implications of ingesting chlorine have not been taken into consideration by the Council.

Many farmers in the area have also reported that their livestock will not drink the chlorinated water, and this will adversely effect their livelihoods.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Chlorination does not seem to cause an issue for stock on other chlorinated supplies. Below are comments from Council staff.

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

[100372] -Tawera Memorial Hall Committee Mr David Topp

Address: 1 George Street Springfield 7681

Postal Address: Springfield

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)

We support the proposal for a district wide rate as long as we are not worse off financially.

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

a. We support this strategy, but want to see it extended from Kirwee to Springfield.

b. Kirwee to Darfield Cycle way - we would like to support the Community Board in their submission to extend the proposed walk cycle way to Springfield.

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

a. That the Tawera Memorial Hall Committee support the proposal for a BMX track in the old Shingle Pit beside the fire station.

b. That the Tawera Memorial Hall Committee want to keep the services of the Roving Committee secretary and would like funding to be made available to pay for this service. The Roving Committee secretary has been invaluable to our Committee for the past six years. We are very happy to continue with this service in the future, and would like to request funding to pay for this service.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

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. The draft 2018 Walking and Cycling Plan includes connecting Kirwee to Springfield in successive stages. The first project Darfield to Kirwee is in 2022/24.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action No recommended action made.

Staff Comments Tawera Memorial Hall Committee request discretionary funding to pay for paid Committee Secretary

[100373] - Mr Peter Higgins

Address: 702 McLaughlins Road RD1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

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)

Don't support 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)

Targeted rate increase too high

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 option three

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 option 3 - no 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)

Choose not to introduce new funds

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

Costs appear to outweigh any benefits, eg. Darfield to Kirwee cycle way cost.

Township footpath extension programme is a good idea.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

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

Staff Comments Submission does not support the level of the rate rise associated with SAC development

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Rolleston rate being applied to the proposed Indoor court facility is acknowledged. There is a need to recognize that the facility will be used extensively by residents across Selwyn outside the Rolleston township.

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 Submitter proposes not to introduce any new funding

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Supports township discretionary extension programme more than expensive Darfield to Kirwee project.

[100374] -Kimberley Reserve Committee Mrs Alison Syme

Address: 342 Baultens Road RD 1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: alison@syme.co.nz

Submission

Submission

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

On behalf of the Kimberley Reserve Committee, I request that the Roving Committee Secretary be paid for from extra funds provided by SDC. So I request that extra funds be allocated to the Kimberley Reserve Board to cover these secretarial costs.

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	Kimberley Reserve Board Committee request increase in discretionary funding to pay for the cost of a paid Committee Secretary

[100375] - Mrs Marilyn Higgins

Address: 702 McLaughlins Road RD 1 7571

Postal Address: Darfield

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)

Do not support this proposal.

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

Increase in targeted rate too costly.

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 option 3 - if this project goes ahead. Perhaps some of the sports groups and users of this facility should fundraise towards the cost.

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

Support option 3 - no additional chlorination of supplies.

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

Do not support this proposal

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

Do not support proposal.

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

Do not support the rate payer having to fund this. Some projects appear to be beneficial, i.e Jones Road cycleway, township footpath extension programme.

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

Increase in rates and / or targeted rates too high.

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 the level of targeted rate is too high

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for a Rolleston based 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](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: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	If this submission was accepted in full or in part, then the following would be impacted:
Staff Comments	Submission did not support Community Grants Scheme.

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	Eligible cycleway projects are proposed to be subsidised by the NZTA but not all - such as those outside Greater Christchurch where there a tangible transport benefits.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

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

[100376] - Mrs Keren Ericksen

Address: 8 Cross Street Coalgate Coalgate

Postal Address: Coalgate

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)

I think this idea could turn very unfair on the small communities further out from Rolleston Bigger 'mini' cities like Rolleston have enough pay to pay its needs.

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

As I live in Coalgate with my family, we take our kids to Darfield to swim. Never Rolleston. It would make sense for us to put our rates into developing a bigger pool here to use in winter. I can't afford to support a pool we never use, and not support our own 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)

This may be a 'nice' for Rolleston, but we in Coalgate/ Glentunnel have basic sports halls that we could use and get done up. So no, I don't have the money to support Rolleston.

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 noticed there is not a strict accountability for SICON to make sure they test and measure their chlorine. I have been sick - too much chlorine.

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 does not support development and suggests greater investment in Darfield Pool

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Chlorine levels are monitored to manage within guideline values. 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.”

[100377] - Mrs Glenyis Carr

Address: 27 Rembrandt Drive Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

Submission

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

How about putting in a hydroslide for the kids. We really need a 50m pool now instead of a few years down the track.

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)

What about a bowling green for the elderly.

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)

Not that important at the moment. Work on more important issues. Do the extension later when you can afford it.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for SAC development is noted. Submission proposes a 50 metre pool . Officers advise that Hon Megan Woods in Press Release 27 April, confirms the CCC Metro Sports facility is back on track and includes a 50 metre pool complex. Sport Canterbury reconfirms its support for a 25 metre pool as being sufficient for future needs in Selwyn.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comment is made re the support or otherwise of the Indoor court proposal. In terms of bowling greens the current Lincoln and West Melton clubs have capacity to cater for Rolleston residents and the needs analysis did not suggest enough demand for an indoor lawn bowling green in the proposed facility.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100378] - Lindsay Blackmore

Address: 108 Dunns Crossing Road RD 8 7678

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: l.j.blackmore@icloud.com

Submission

Submission

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

Seal extensions - we fully support reinstatement of the seal extension programme (pg 35).

These roads now carry huge volumes of traffic and are not designed for such numbers. Dunns Crossing Road is a feeder road for Rolleston, and as a resident and users, we look forward to it being used.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The submitter supports the seal extension programme and Dunns Crossing Rd.

[100379] -Ladbrooks Hall Committee Mrs Margaret Bothwell

Address: 79 Leadleys Road RD 4 Ladbrooks 764

Postal Address: Christchurch

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)

This topic generated the most discussion. In part initiated by a ratepayer who challenged us to survey Ladbrooks area to get a true indication. However this was not wanted by committee members. We can to an agreement that although it would cost us \$57.00 more, the outcome would be fair and beneficial. Central organization would work, but a member would still need to be there when a hirer was setting up and finishing.

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

The committee would recommend a 50m pool rather than 25m

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, to indoor courts and sports hub, but funds still needed to maintain and upgrade other township facilities. District wide rates acceptable with added development contributions.

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 agreed that land owners who benefit directly from access to water races should fund the cost. Those who put in wells and irrigate pay for that use.

7. New facilities in Hororata, Leeston and Prebbleton

With the size of the population in these areas, we are surprised that work has not started already.

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 had no problem with the proposal to extend the SDC offices, as more staff will be needed to cater for population growth. Also larger meeting areas will be needed to liaise with community committees.

Good function designs can work well without enhancements of artworks and state of the art furniture.

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

It was interesting during these discussions just how many people would prefer short, simple facts and figures on paper, rather than online.

We found a glossy insert from a local publication the most useful as a starting point.

We realized also just how disinterested people were in the whole process, but they will be the first to complain and expect discount hire rates at the hall.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted. When preparing the business case for the SAC extension, consideration was given for a 50 metre pool. As part of a Canterbury wide network of pools, 25 metres for SAC was considered appropriate to meet the community demand and to efficiently manage the financial investment in aquatics. 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 No recommended action made.

Staff Comments Support for the proposed indoor court facility is acknowledged as well as support for a district funding model. Staff agree that a network of facilities is required in Selwyn with smaller local community facilities complimented by a major regional facility.

Topic: 5. Water Races standard district rate - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Staff comments are provided below:

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

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

[100380] -The Vintage Village Trust Mr Murray Stephens

Address: 13 Flannery Street Leeston 7656

Postal Address: PO Box 4 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: waipuna.bc@scorch.co.nz

Submission

-

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.

[100381] -Killinchy Community Centre Mr Stan Pycroft

Address: c/- Sandra Opie, Secretary 741 Southbridge Dunsandel
Road 7682

Postal Address: RD 2 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: sandra.opie@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)

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Incentive for volunteering: The Killinchy Community Centre Committee has done an excellent job in looking after this facility and has demonstrated genuine community pride in maintaining and managing it and we would expect the local community to continue to take a lead role in looking after it in the future. We would, therefore, encourage volunteers to stay involved. There are lots of reasons for volunteering, with real benefits for the community and volunteers themselves.

Priority for Funding: Asset and financial plans for this facility will continue to be developed with input from the local committee and this includes defining priority projects. Projects related to playground safety, as an example, are given a high priority in programming because of the risk to public health and safety. The other example given related to protection of heritage trees is also likely to be given some priority in programming as it relates to asset protection. Overall Council needs to consider how the funds are best allocated to meet the community needs while ensuring assets are maintained to a serviceable standard. There may be some “enhancement” projects that would not be regarded as a high priority but with community input and/or alternative funding sources these can still proceed.

Centralised Booking System: The centralised booking system is aimed at providing information and access to all facilities for customer to ensure they are well used. It looks at the provision and availability of these facilities from a network perspective rather than as standalone facilities. As part of establishing the system there can be restrictions placed on the use of certain facilities (e.g. this venue is not suitable for birthdays 18 years and below). Also the system will need to provide information to the committee person who is responsible for bookings so that booking requirements can be met and the use confirmed.

Fees and Charges: Council recognises that there are a myriad of different fees currently applied between facilities. Ultimately the objective will be to provide standardisation of fees across the district based on the services/facilities provided but this will involve a transition period. Fees and charges would be set in accordance with a graduated scale to reflect the level of service provided and any other inputs that need to be considered. This approach addresses the current inequities whereby a user might pay double the amount per hour for hall hire compared with another similar venue.

[100382] - Mr Dene Wason

Address: 677 Pig Saddle Road Russells Flat 7580

Postal Address: Sheffield RD

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: dene.wason@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)

Nowhere in the Long Term Plan for water schemes does it consider the suitability of treatment for stock needs. The Malvern Hills water scheme was primarily put in for agricultural use. Our experience from 1976 - 1981 a sheep and beef farmers was that in summer months, young stock thirsty and stressed wouldn't drink chlorinated water around our farm.

Until after much investigating and consulting in 1981, we left the scheme. It wasn't until 1988 when the Council installed the UV treatment, we agreed to come back on. There have been no problems since.

I see no evidence our good water needs chlorination except for times of turbidity and transgressions.

-

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission. Modern chlorination equipment provides a constant continuously monitored level of chlorine. Rural water supplies which currently have chlorination don't seem to have issues with stock not drinking the water. Below are comments from Council staff.

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

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

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

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

[100383] -Hororata Reserve Management Committee Mr David Sligh

Address: Hororata Road RD 2 7572

Postal Address: Springfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: hamptonsligh@xtra.co.nz

Submission

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Hororata/Leeston/Prebbleton Community Facilities: The submitter's view that the Hororata Hall is no longer fit for purpose and needs to be replaced is consistent with Council's assessment of the situation and the proposal to provide a new multi-purpose facility for the community. Support for the proposal to provide a purpose built facility to service Hororata is noted.

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

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

Staff Comments Hororata Reserve Operating Expenditure: The 2017/18 budget appears to be inadequate to meet the cost requirements and is already over for the year. Some adjustments Have been made in developing the draft LTP but may not be sufficient to meet costs especially related maintenance activities. Staff agree that a further budget increase is required for 2018/19 and this will have a marginal impact on the targeted rate or district rate whichever is confirmed. It is noted that revenues from hires and charges are up for 2017/18 and the revenue target could be increased by around \$3,000 to help offset costs.

Hororata Reserve Operating Projects: The painting budget reflects earlier advice from the committee. This can be consolidated as proposed to the 2019/20 year with a small increase of \$862. Staff agree that relocation of the playground makes sense. This would be cost neutral whereby the 2017/18 soft fall budget is reallocated for this purpose with a minor increase required of \$1,168.

Hororata Reserve Capital Expenditure: Carry forward provision has been made for the projects listed in the submission and to combine these budgets for the pavilion project. The committee has requested extra funding for the playground and to resurface tennis courts totaling \$75,800 (once budget reallocations have been taken into account). This would have an impact on the targeted rate or district rate whichever is confirmed. Staff would recommend that the courts are re-assessed to define the requirements before accepting this budget increase and then to review as part of Annual Plan processes. The initial budget for the playground in 2024/25 is to replace the existing equipment and does not provide for improvements. If combined with the total provided for soft fall replacement (\$23,600) a total of \$51,600 would be available. Council could decide to increase this to the \$60,000 requested. Staff note that there will still be requirement to replace the playground soft fall in the future (at around 5 year intervals).

[100384] - John and Sue Boyd

Address: Not provided Not provided Not provided

Postal Address: Not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: john.sueboyd@outlook.com

Submission

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.”

[100385] - Mr Andrew Gebbie

Address: Rolleston College Rolleston Rolleston

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: andrew.gebbie@rollestoncollege.nz

Submission

Submission

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

Yes, we 100% support the proposal to extend the aquatics facility. We would love to run an extensive aquatics programme at the College, and this would assist us greatly.

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 sooner the better! This is an amazing opportunity. The additional inside and specialist space would greatly benefit a growing college's sports and physical education programme.

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

Yes, really good for an actively community. Safe opportunities for travel of our college's community is a good thing.

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 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.

[100386] - Mr Kelvin Coe

Address: The Grange Irwell 7683

Postal Address: RD 3 Leeston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: kjandacoe@actrix.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)

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

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.

**[100387] -Rolleston Community Centre Management Committee
Jocelyn Lewes**

Address: Not provided Not provided Not provided

Postal Address: Not provided

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: rcc.gc@selwyn.govt.nz

Submission

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - 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	Rolleston Community Centre - Development of former library space: The Rolleston Community Centre Committee's support for this project and the need to provide extra community space at this busy facility is noted .

[100388] -Hope Presbyterian Church Senior Pastor Hamish Galloway

Address: 27 Ames Road Hornby 8042

Postal Address: Christchurch

Phone (day): 980 2296

Phone (mobile):

Email: info@hopechurch.net.nz

Submission

Topic: Development Contributions Policy - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.
Staff Comments	The Council's Development Contributions Policy only allows for remissions in certain circumstances. One of these is if the development will reduce the requirement for community facilities in the District. It is not clear the extent to which this development will achieve this. The Council could consider making a grant to the Hope Presbyterian Church to cover the cost of development contributions for this project.

[100389] -Down by the Liffey Gallery Mr Jim Conolly

Address: 1 James Street Lincoln 7608

Postal Address: Lincoln

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: liffeygallery1@gmail.com

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)

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 suggests greater level of funding is required for Community Grants Fund with particular consideration for arts and culture.

[100390] - Mrs Cherry Stanger

Address: 5 Thomas Street Kirwee 7543

Postal Address: Kirwee

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: redcherryamos@gmail.com

Submission

Submission

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

Yes. Excellent news. I support the much needed expansion. I think a 50m pool would be more appropriate long-term. The population of the district will continue to grow so do it right this time - rather than hurry to re-do it again in a few more years.

I hope there will be a sauna/plunge pool combo. And maybe a steam room too. Luxury!

A café will be great, especially if it is more health conscious, than the regular cares in the area!

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

I am sad that the underlying cause of water quality is not being addressed here. A temporary treatment of the water until those issues are remedied would be more appropriate long-term.

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

I'm really excited about the Kirwee to Darfield cycleway. How amazing to have safe cycleways between the townships.

Also a real boom for tourists. I often worry for their safety along the highway - can be very enjoyable with big trucks hurtling by.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for SAC development is noted. Submission proposes a 50 metre pool on the basis of "future proofing" for a larger population . Officers advise that Hon Megan Woods in Press Release 27 April, confirms the CCC Metro Sports facility is back on track and includes a 50 metre pool complex. Sport Canterbury reconfirms its support for a 25 metre pool as being sufficient for future needs in Selwyn. Submitter also proposes the inclusion of a sauna, steam room and plunge pool as well as a cafe focused on health

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 including Darfield to Kirwee.

[100391] - Mr Edward Woodhill

Address: 7 New Creek Mews Levi Park 7614

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: e.woodhill@xtra.co.nz

Submission

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for SAC extension is noted , however the submission does not support inclusion of cafe and gym / wellbeing space.

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. Staff agree with the comment that the facility must not be developed in isolation from what is happening in Christchurch and this principle is at the heart of design considerations around this facility. It will compliment and not duplicate what Christchurch has or is developing as a regional approach has been taken to what it needs to provide.

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 Scheme noted. Submitter emphasized importance of all successful funding contributing clearly to goals of Council and supports regular monitoring and evaluation

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 and Leeston is acknowledged as is the opposition to the Prebbleton facility. Prebbleton is an important part of Selwyn District and is a growing town with inadequate community facilities to meet demand.

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. Positively acknowledges the Lincoln to Rolleston Cycleway. The reference to the issue of rural roads west of SH1 is acknowledged. Councils planned arterial seal widening programme in the LTP will assist by providing wider sealed shoulders that cyclists can use to increase separation and therefore safety.

Topic: Libraries - 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 questioned relevance of libraries in these times. Submitter would be interested in evaluation findings and report a less than satisfactory customer experience which Officers will follow up on.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Council acknowledges the Submitters concerns regarding Road Safety. Council is fully engaged in national, regional and district discussions on road safety issues relating to the Governments recent stated objectives on this.

[100392] - Mrs Sally Brown

Address: 6 Jackson Street Darfield 7510

Postal Address: Darfield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: icsmbrown@xtra.co.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)

Remember other Rural Towns too. Centralisation kills local support. Don't destroy communities.

7. Proposed new community centres

Needed in the three communities. Rolleston can help other areas too.

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 Comments around the need for local facilities are acknowledged. Council staff believe a network of facilities are required across Selwyn whereby local facilities are provided and complimented by one regional one capable of holding major and multiple events.

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 The issue around parking at Darfield around the shops/bakery has been extensively canvassed before. Limited areas for frontage parking combined with the SH1 under the management of NZTA are complicating factors. Council believed the commercial operators should provide more parking, likely behind the businesses, for their patrons. The Submitters suggestion to install a public car park north of the railway line places it on public recreational reserve and across a public walkway. Its likely to be to far away form the main street and the issue at hand to be effective.

[100393] - Mr Ivan Robertson

Address: 304 Brooklands Road Rolleston 7678

Postal Address: No 8 RD

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

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 proposal providing there is sufficient parking offroad.

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

If chlorination is necessary do it on a risk assessment.

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 increasing carparking

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Thank you for your submission and support for a risk based approach to chlorination.

Below are comments from Council staff.

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

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

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

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

Reasons why chlorination is required in addition to UV treatment UV (ultra violet

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

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The submitter supports the sealing of Dunns Crossing Rd. Road marking for all of Dunns Crossing will considered when the sealing is complete. The Dunns Crossing/Goulds is a five rural legged intersection and not currently suitable to be reconfigured into a roundabout. This is more likely when the area is rezoned for urban development. However current plans include lighting the intersection to assist in visibility.

[100394] - Mrs Colleen Cleary

Address: 27 West Street Whitecliffs 7673

Postal Address: Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email:

Submission

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)

How can we protect our clean, green image when we treat our water with chlorine, that even our animals refuse to drink?

There must be a better way. With our 'state of the art' knowledge of; and production of materials to produce resilient and cost-effective pipelines

Couldn't the Whitecliffs township become a pilot scheme that the whole of our country could follow? For those who illegally tamper with or endeavor to hook into the scheme, there must be greater penalties.

That the pipeline is laid low enough to avoid accidental ruptures, and that its course be clearly marked above ground.

Some years ago, a friend and I were sightseeing in Italy. It took us about eight days to work our way up from Sicily to Rome. To be safe, I used water purification tablets. There were chlorine-based. By the time we reached Rome, I had been suffering constant nausea. I knew that Rome's water supply from its ancient aquifers was fresh and clean and I was able to enjoy its purity. Their pipelines are clean and safe.

Why can't we, with our modern know-how, produce a good pipeline? Cost too much?

Surely some of the grandiose building projects could be put on hold while we get back to the basics. Clean fresh 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.”

[100395] - Mr Arend Kuiper

Address: 2467 Homebush Road RD 1 7673

Postal Address: Coalgate

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: aart.niecy@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)

For the record, I am opposed to the chlorination of water as supplied to us by the Selwyn District Council.

I have been a ratepayer in the district for 15 years now and pay for 3 units from the restricted supply. In our second summer here, I noticed we were not getting the water we should to our tank. This turned out to be because the toby valve was very old and weeping, and invaded by tree roots.

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.”

[100396] - Mrs G. Denise Reynolds

Address: 29 Mathias Street Darfield 7510

Postal Address: Darfield

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)

Not with the rates. What bothers me is this year's rates (18/19) and next years. There are two steep rises before flattening out - for the smaller communities. Is it possible make this stretch out, or not?

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

They are needed. I would suggest that, as the SAC will probably out-grow the present upgrades in a few years, that you would considering upgrading the Darfield Pool. By this, (I see its being done 19/20) I mean building another pool; heating properly both pools, covering both pools and generally making it available for the wider Malvern area.

This would help reduce the 'stress' on the use of SAC and help the new SAC to last longer.

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)

When this facility is built would the "Foster Park" rate be taken off the rates? If not, would / could it be used to upgrade another, smaller centre e.g. in Darfield as Darfield is the biggest town in the Malvern Ward.

Something that would service a lot of the smaller communities out here - and save the cost of travelling to Rolleston - which can be difficult for those on lower incomes. There are a lot of 'lower income families' in this area.

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

Option three is what I would like to see implemented. Everyone I have spoken to has been against chlorination treatment.

One of my concerns is that 'it' would be forced on the entire Selwyn district - at a later date. In Darfield we have two very good deep wells that will be able to provide for our current, and projected population for some time to come.

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.

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. As I understand pages 26/27 you are only targeting higher income families / properties for \$10 a year. That seems very reasonable.

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

As above

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

Yes - social housing. There is a lot of energy - attention for this in Malvern / Darfield area. This subject will not go away as there are people in need, in all age groups, out here.

It is in our interests to see that people have a reasonable quality of life - makes for better communities. Many elderly are relocating to CHCH because there is not a wide enough range of facilities. I know SDC doesn't want to be involved in social housing. We have been told that before!!

We are asking for input from SDC e.g. sit down with interested groups - see how SDC can support them with advice, transparency around rules and regulations, and staff who are qualified in their areas of expertise. Is this too much to ask?

Would be nice if you could give us a helping hand in some of this please.

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The only realistic way of smoothing the rates increase, is to introduce the new district wide rates in a stepped way. This would only defer the rates increases to future years.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for SAC development is noted and planned upgrade of Darfield Pool. Submission proposes greater than planned investment in Darfield Pool when its redevelopment is planned in 10 year plan

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Comments around the need for local facilities are acknowledged. Council staff believe a network of facilities are required across Selwyn whereby local facilities are provided and complimented by one regional one capable of holding major and multiple events.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The submitter has unfortunately assumed that the example means that only properties above \$600,000 will be levied an additional; rate. This assumption is incorrect but properties with a lower capital value than \$600,000 will pay slightly less than \$10 per annum.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments The Submitter is in support (presumed).

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.

[100397] - Mr Jens Christensen

Address: 704 East Maddisons Road Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: kajens70@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! Rolleston has had enough of providing district facilities from its development contributions.

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

Yes!

1. Don't mess with another 25m pool. Go straight to a competition 50m pool. Even if it has a moveable 3.0m walls. This needs tiered seating for spectators for competition swimming. 2. No gym required. Provide enterprise has provided enough of these. 3. Doubt the worth of a café - again the domain of private enterprise 4. More play equipment including hydroslide.

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 indoor courts (4) and covered courts (4) need to happen ASAP. But make sure that the Indoor courts can be expanded. Must be funded by district 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)

Some community supplies maybe, but Rolleston's supply is secure, and must not be chlorinated.

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. Not enough money allocated for the grant scheme - 2 or 3 times the allocation is what is required.

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

Yes. Work on time management, and the need for more staff will go away.

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

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support is noted. 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. Submission does not support cafe and gym / wellbeing space and submission supports inclusion of a hydroslide

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for both the proposed Indoor court facility and the district funding model is acknowledged. Noted and agreed that the facility is required in the short term and should not be not be delayed or downsized.

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: 6. Community Grant Funding Schemes combination - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

Support for Community Grant Scheme noted. Submitter proposed an increase of funding in this scheme by Council to something in vicinity of \$280,000 - \$420,000.

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: Roading - General - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments It is not supported the submitters request to include the seal widening of Maddisons Rd into the seal widening programme. Traffic patterns in the wider area are significantly disrupted with the construction of CSM2 and IPORT which is distorting routes and flows. It is advised Council reassess this and other changes needed on this network once CSM2 is completed and traffic patterns are normalised. Council has just introduced a 80kph speed limit on Maddisons Rd. The Wordsworth Street Extension is part of the Council adopted Rolleston Town Centre Master Plan and is funded in the current LTP. The formal planning of the area was confirmed in a LURP action and is now in the District Plan, including the accompanying ODP showing the road network including the Wordsworth St Extension. The extension is essential to provide access to the new retail developments in the area, public park parks, and reimagined reserve. This link includes for combined walk/cycle facilities as well that will integrate with the network in the redeveloped reserve. Council will be consulting with the Community on the how all the new and upgraded town centre roads will be designed - like any new project, but not on the need for them as this has already legally established. Council and Consultants are currently working the designs at the moment.

[100398] -Rolleston Residents Association Inc Mr Jens Christensen

Address: 704 East Maddisons Road Rolleston 7614

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: kajens70@gmail.com

Submission

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

The Association supports the proposal

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

The Association supports the expansion proposal.

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

The Association supports the development in indoor courts at Foster Park. The Association supports and insists on district wide funding for these.

In essence to date, the ratepayers of Rolleston have funded 100% of Foster Park which is in essence a district facility and this is most unfair.

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 Association is vehemently opposed to the chlorination of Rolleston's water supply. It does however have no opinion on the chlorination of other townships.

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

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the proposed indoor court facility at Foster park and associated district wide funding model is acknowledged. The submission points to the fact that the whole of the Foster Park development has been funded by Rolleston ratepayers when in fact they operate as a District facility accessed and used by residents from across the Selwyn community.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - 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.

[100399] -Rolleston Lions Club Mr Brian Whittington

Address: 19 Dynes Road Rolleston 7615

Postal Address: Rolleston

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: bricris@globe.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)

Support 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)

Support extensions, plus café.

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

Needs to be for all, not just one or two groups.

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 support chlorination.

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 problem with extension, but need more car parking

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

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for the Indoor court 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 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 Council needs to meet the current District Plan requirements. the additional carparking of 122 allows for the following: - replacing the carpark to be removed when Moore Street is extended (38) - allowing for a park n ride facility - 40 - additional carparking for the HQ facility - 44

Topic: Proposed new facility/facilities - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments

No comments made.

[100400] - Mr Michael Burgess

Address: 4 Farr Street c/- Glenntunnel Post Office 7638

Postal Address: Whitecliffs

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)

Chlorine is not a very nice product. Why would I want to put it into my body. There are enough nasties floating around without compulsory force feeding of more.

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 believe the system should be kept up to scratch, but have to ask why has it been allowed to get run down.

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 to extension. Why would I want to have an extension to a facility where the head of a particular department could not get off his backside to come and talk to me. Told his receptionist to tell me I was at lunch, you see I could lip read her side of the conversation. This was before midday (early lunch eh!!). Why would I want the employment of more of the same attitude.

Trees were uprooted in 2013 storm, lifted my water mains in two places. Your trees were leaning on my fences and garden. . 67 years old had to climb and drop the trees. It took the Council 'x' years and a ten tonne digger to fix main and take away root ball. By the way, the contractor you use did a very good job

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

I see we at Whitecliffs, Glentunnel and Coalgate have to travel longer distances to most, but appear to have the greater rate increases (according to your rating examples).

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: 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.

[100401] -Sheffield Hall Committee (Item one) Michelle Webster

Address: 1 Mye Lane Sheffield 7500

Postal Address: Sheffield

Phone (day):

Phone (mobile):

Email: myehouse1@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)

Will attend hearing on behalf of Sheffield Hall Committee to speak on this subject only.

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

Have never used it and never will. Whilst our own pool suffers under truly terrible management by SDC. \$20,000 in debt at the start of last summer, making a joke of our committee and pool, with most locals choosing to swim at the Waimak.

It's only a matter of time till a death at either pool by too many swimmers squashed into reduced hours leaving the pool closed longer, or the dangers of a large river with 60-70 swimming most times we went to the river.

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 if funded from option three - completely unfair if those who will never use it have to pay.

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)

Giving up our wonderful clean water to suit a North Island incident. In 20 years, Sheffield have only had five boil water notices: 2 for flooding; 2 for pipe cuts, and how we have a backwash problem. Isolate it, fix it! Give us back our water. This has only happened in the last few connections, so it's not that hard.

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

I agree to make it fairer, but CPW has thrown a spanner in the works. Council promised races would remain open to those that wanted and now have continued to break that promise over and over.

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)

Having applied for these grants for our A & P shows, and a thank you for the fire brigades and St Johns. The realization the applications weren't getting through to the Committee. All faith in this process has gone. This should be for groups that have no other way to raise \$\$ needed.

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 is essential. A long-awaited rebuild for a country hall that along with others, the Council has turned a blind eye to for so long but collected rates for, then made it so hard to use.

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

Disagree with the high staff turnover and multiple part-timers. It's time to look internally! Disconnection from other departments happens extensively, now holding up multiple decisions and confusion. E.g. three sets of officials visited Sheffield over footpaths, none had or would talk to each other. There is very few committed employees that represent SDC adequately with more and more bad representation with less confidence for all ratepayers.

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

Cycling strategy - totally disagree. A waste of ratepayers money when our existing roads are in disrepair, with constant potholes, bumps and known black spots, e.g. Waddington Corner, Sheffield Bakery, where a bit of common sense in design will stop deaths.

Footpaths - finally done in Sheffield after 28 years of asking.

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

Topic: 1. District-wide Rate - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.

Topic: 2. SAC Extensions - Community Services

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

Staff Comments Submission focused on Sheffield Pool; high operating costs and too high a number of customers. The submitter suggested Pool commenced operations this financial years with a \$20,000 debt. Officers advise this is incorrect . Sheffield opened with a \$7,000 debt only. For this financial year expenditure at Sheffield pool is tracking \$5,000 below budget and while further electricity charges are to be received, expenditure is anticipated to come in below budget. Income is tracking to come in \$200.00 below budget, but this is due to the Committee AGM decision to reduce the charge to the local school from \$1,000 (previous years) to \$500.00 Gate sales were \$2,725 this financial year and "Key" income was \$1,687 compared to previous year in which Gate sales were \$1,223.00 this financial year and "Key" income was \$2,113.00; and overall increase of \$1,000 over the season. The increase in patronage is viewed as positive by officers.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Support for this facility based on local Rolleston funding is acknowledged. The needs analysis conducted around this facility demonstrates that high levels of use will be made of these facilities from areas outside Rolleston.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 expressed disappointment at past failures to secure community grants funding. The intent with revised process is to increase opportunity, accountability and transparency

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

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

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

Topic: 8. SDC HQ Extension - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The submitters comments are noted but are not accepted as representing the efforts of staff in serving their community.

Topic: 9. Walking and Cycling Strategy - Assets

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	The submitter is not in support.

Topic: Parks and Reserves - General - Property & Commercial

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	No comments made.

Topic: Roving Secretary - Community Services

Staff Recommended Action	That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments	Submission proposes Sheffield Committee do not require a paid Committee Secretary and have had requests from within Committee to undertake duties of secretary on a voluntary basis.

[100402] - Mr Kevin Brown

Address: 1926 Tramway Road 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)

(a) My comments encapsulate all the objections presented to Council the last time this was mooted three years ago. (b) I am aware governing bodies hope by continual re-evaluation, to wear down objectors to get their own way. (c) The philosophy of 'user pays' applies here. (d) volunteers do not want to operate under a situation in which they 'don't' get the true stay at all. (e) as in the past, communities should provide their own facilities (f) many outside of these facility areas will not use them, so it becomes an unfair burden upon them just because it is 'available'.

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

(a) the aquatic centre is already an unfair cost to those who do not use it, so Roger Douglas' and future governments belief in it should be adhered to 'user pays' (b) the extension will be a want; as other places are available for swimming, and the burden to ratepayers is once again exorbitant. (c) share facilities more broadly across the county if the aquatic centre is not big enough (it is plenty big enough for Rolleston) (d) all new facilities should be provided by the local community, and if the Council then takes over management and maintenance, 'fine and goo', but not to the point of ownership.

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) Foster Park is in Rolleston, have it if Rolleston are willing to pay for it, then users can also be charged for that privilege if they come from another area to help in the payment of the facilities provided. Targeted rate paid by Rolleston ratepayers. (b) A large majority of people outside of Rolleston will never use Foster Park or the indoor courts etc. So once again, it would be extremely unfair to charge them. We are all one Selwyn District, but not only one town exists, regardless of size and population.

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 preference for this by myself and others on the Sheffield scheme is do not do it, rather secure and maintain all aspects of the scheme in a way that this is unnecessary and the problem requiring the chlorination is avoided.

This may required better tracking of where the problems come from. A deep well bore would be a good start. If a problem is found even though a bit late, then temporary chlorination would be enough. So please, no knee-jerk reaction to Havelock North's trouble.

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

(a) similar to my other comments, but in Hororata's case, insurance should be a major contributor and if Council had failed to fully insure, then other funds should be provided by Council, e.g. IZone profits, not a further charge on ratepayers.

So the main users should firstly provide their own facilities, then if the people want it, Council could then be responsible for management and maintenance.

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

Yes, DONT DO IT. The more bureaucracy we have been getting, the more incompetency we receive. So the ideal is to decrease staffing for better efficiency, meaning there is too much space in the present building for requirements

I also notice with the growth, the most efficient workers who know what they rae doing and are helpful to clients are laid off, squeezed out, or leave for better workplaces (*such examples - the staff that used to be at the Darifled Library / Service Centre). They even knew what accounts money was to go into!

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

People are able to walk and cycle many places without the most up to date sealed ways. If It is a bit of a 'mountaineering experience' all the better. People would get fitter and many cyclists ride mountain bikes.

Except in places of absolute 'safety required' the money should be transferred and used for roading as the present funding level still appears woefully inadequate.

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

Listen to what the 'majority' have already made known you to you and save them from frequently going over the same ground, with the hope that this time a 'minority' group will put in more submissions that the rest who are against something.

I speak from the change I have seen over the past 30 years, I have attended my local township meeting and dealings with 'Council'.

Thank you for your consideration of my point of view and strong feelings on Council matters.

Keep rates way down - almost no increases on anything.

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 does not support SAC development. Submission proposes local communities build and own future pools while council manages and maintains thereafter. It is unclear to Officer how a community could fundraise for the total cost of a pool and understand that Council would still "own" the pool.

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments This submission suggests that Rolleston alone should pay for this facility. However as demonstrated already by the Aquatics Centre model and Foster Park generally these regional level facilities are accessed and used by a wide cross-section of the Selwyn community. The needs analysis conducted around the Indoor court facility clearly showed that the facility will be used regularly by residents outside the Rolleston township.

Topic: 4. Chlorination - Assets

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments Very little damage actually occurred to the Hororata Hall. The payout of \$70,000 is included as a funding source.

The comment about Izone is noted but surplus funds are being allocated to the Rolleston Library/Community Space, \$5.5 million, with the balance to be allocated on the spending programme over the next 10 years.

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 unless necessary for safety and mountain biking orientated.

Topic: General Rates Comments - Corporate

Staff Recommended Action That the submission be acknowledged.

Staff Comments No comments made.
